

4

Seasonable Advice
CONCERNING
QUAKERISM;
OR,

A Short Account of some of the *Quaker-Errours*, both in Principle and Practice.

Wherein are contain'd,

Some *Blasphemous* Expressions, and several *New* Quotations taken out of the *Quakers* most approved Authors, and never yet before mention'd by any that have wrote against them.

Fitted for the meanest Capacities.

Written chiefly for the Use of a private Parish, and now made publick for the Benefit of the Unlearned Members of the Church of *England*, who have any *Quakers* or *Quakerly-Meetings* amongst them, or in their Neighbour-hood.

By J. STILLINGFLEET, Rector of *Beckingham* in *Lincolnshire*.

The Devil hath much made himself manifest, and hath acted in and by his Servants, and hath blasphemed the God of Heaven, and caused the Truth to be evil spoken of—Quaker Burroughs in his Epistle to C. Atkinson's Standard of the Lord.

L O N D O N,
Printed for Henry Mortlock, at the Phoenix in
St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1702.

26th Nov 1817

COVENTRY

TO THE HONORABLE

A. J. B. Esq. Secretary of the
Board of Directors of the
West India Company

Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th inst. in relation to the above mentioned subject, and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration.

I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
J. B. Esq.

Wm. B. Esq.

Wm. B. Esq.

Wm. B. Esq.

Wm. B. Esq.

23/17

THE INTRODUCTION.

My Friends and Brethren.

Seeing in these days of Liberty, the Calves of Jeroboam are set up amongst us, I thought I could not employ some part of my time better, than to endeavour with God's Assistance to preserve you in the true Worship of the God of Israel. And I think the Obligation that lies upon me to promote the Salvation of your Souls, will be a Sufficient Apology for this Undertaking. I am very sensible the Errors of Quakerism have of late been so notoriously exposed to the World, that there's little new to be said on a Subject, that seems to be already exhausted. However this shall not prevent me giving you some ac-

The Introduction.

count of the Quakers Practices and Principles. For though the Quaker-Controversie has at large been discussed in several late Treatises *, yet it cannot be supposed, that Persons of your employments should either have the leisure or opportunity to read them; I shall therefore for your sakes lay together some of their Erroneous Doctrines, that you may see what vile Heresies have been taught and published by their Principal Leaders; thereby to arm you, if it be God's Will, against the cunning Craftiness of Men, who lie in wait to deceive.

* The Snake in the Grass, The Defence of the Snake, Keir's 4. Narrative, &c.

Ephes. 4.
14.

The Contents.

CHAP. I.

Of the Quaker-Practices. Pag. 1

SECT. I.

Mighty Pretences to a more than ordinary Sanctity, and odd Distinctions from the rest of the World, shewn to be some of the usual Arts, and Methods made use of heretofore by the Pharisees, and others to gain Profelytes; and therefore not to be regarded in the Quakers. Ib.

SECT. II.

Their Scruples about Thee and Thou proved to be childish and trifling, and of no consequence in Religion. P. 4

The Contents.

SECT. III.

Fox's Orders about unnecessary Buttons, &c. and the Quakers Conceits about their Habits and Dresses, the effects of a gross and unaccountable Superstition.

P. 7

SECT. IV.

The Quakers refusing to take off their Hats to their Superiours and Magistrates as a Mark of Respect, made appear to be an Offence against the Laws of God and Man; and obliging their Apprentices and Servants to give to themselves this very Mark of Respect which they deny to others, is such a Practice that never can be reconciled with their Principles.

P. 11

SECT. V.

Fox blasphemously called himself, The Son of God; and the Quakers have lately defended him in this, consequently are guilty of Blasphemy themselves.

P. 14

SECT. VI.

Of the Idolatrous Practices of the Quakers

The Contents.

kers in worshipping G. Fox, proved from undeniable Instances; which they can neither confute nor deny, as is plain from their guilty Extases in the Switch for the Snake. p. 16

SECT. VII.

Their Objection against civil Titles from Job 32. 21, 22. shewn to be frivolous and groundless; plain Proofs from the Examples of the best Men recorded in the Old Testament, that they never scrupled giving Titles of Honour or Respect; nor do we read of their being ever reprov'd for these matters; nor were Civil Titles ever forbidden by Christ or his Apostles. p. 20

SECT. VIII.

Their main Objection from Matt. 23. 10. proved to be as weak and insufficient as the former. The meaning of our Saviours Words, neither be ye called Masters, briefly explained. An instance of the Quakers being Masters in that very sence, expressly contrary to our Saviours Command. p. 22

The Contents.

CHAP. II.

Of the *Quakers* Principles; especially concerning their absurd Notion of the Light within; with some of its mischievous Consequences. p. 25

SECT. I.

Plain proofs out of their most approved Writings, that they differ from us and all Christians in their Principles. Ib.

SECT. II.

Of the Light Within; G. Fox no Instrument as the Quakers pretend in directing Men to the true Notions of it; the Orthodox and Christian Sense of the Light Within briefly stated and explained; the Church of England no Enemy to its truly Christian Sense, as plainly appears from our publick Offices; the Quakers also have lately acknowledged that the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit is owned by our Church.

p. 28

SECT.

The Contents.

SECT. III.

The Quakers Notions of the Light Within shown to be Blasphemous and Anti-Christian; 1st. Because they have affirmed the Light Within to be God, and have denied Him to be in Heaven. 2dly. Because they believe it to be Christ, not only his Spiritual appearance, but that the very Person of Christ is Within them.

P. 35

SECT. IV.

Several Instances of the Quakers believing only in the Light, or Christ within; of their denying Jesus Christ to have an Human Body now in Heaven.

p. 35

SECT. V.

The Sufficiency of the Light Within to Salvation without something else, i. e. without Faith in an Outward Jesus, a mere Quaker Dream, and expressly contrary to the whole Tenor and design of the Gospel: The Case of Cornelius and the Heathen in general briefly stated and considered. The Quakers Preaching altogether inconsistent with their Notions of the Sufficiency of the Light.

P. 39

SECT.

The Contents.

SECT. VI.

*The Quakers pretences to infallibility
no proof of their being infallible. p. 46*

SECT. VII.

*Their vain Conceits of a Sinless Perfection
disproved out of their own Writings ;
Confession of Sin proved a great Duty
both from exprefs Texts, and the
Examples of the best Men recorded
in the Holy Scriptures : the Quakers
make no publick Confession of their Sins
proved from Authentick Testimonies.
G. Whitehead's Evasions about this
examined and confuted ; A challenge
to the Quakers to make it appear that
they ever confessed their Sins in pub-
lick, or prayed for the Remission of them,
never yet taken any notice of. p. 47*

SECT. VIII.

*The Quakers deny Jesus Christ to be the
Son of God. p. 57*

CHAP. III.

Of the Holy Sacraments. p. 61

SECT. I.

*The Quakers as a plain consequence from
the*

The Contents.

the foregoing Doctrine, deny the sacred Institutions of our Saviour ; viz. outward or Water Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. Water Baptism proved to be expressly commanded by Jesus Christ ; Practised by his Apostles, and the Christian Church in all Ages ever since their time. Some of the Quakers objections against this Institution briefly answered. Ib.

S E C T. II.

The Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper plainly shewn also to be of Divine Institution ; and proved from its end and design, and from the account S. Paul gives us of it, to be of perpetual obligation. What the Quakers can say against it, briefly answered.

p. 68.

S E C T. III.

The Quakers have prophanely abused and reviled these Divine Institutions ; and have set up others of their own invention, which they call the good Ordinances of Jesus Christ.

p. 77.

CHAP.

The Contents.

CHAP. IV.

Of the *Quakers* Contempt of the Holy
Scriptures. p. 86.

SECT. I.

*They deny the Scriptures to be their Rule
of Faith and Practice.* lb.

SECT. II.

*They deny the Holy Scriptures to be the
word of God; yet make no Scruple of
calling their own Writings, the word of
the Lord. They have called the Wri-
tings of the Apostles Dust and Death,
&c. And have published it in Print,
That the Gospel has deceived them,
and yet extoll their own Scribes, as
being given out by the Power and Spi-
rit of God.* p. 91.

SECT. III.

*They never read the Holy Scriptures in
their Meetings, yet have ordered and
commanded their own Epistles to be
read there. Undeniable instances of
this.* p. 99.

The Conclusion.

p. 102.

Seasonable Advice

CONCERNING

QUAKERISM, &c.

CHAP. I.

Of the QUAKER-PRACTICES.

SECT. I.

Mighty Pretences to a more than ordinary Sanctity, and odd Distinctions from the rest of the World, shown to be some of the usual Arts, and Methods made use of heretofore by the Pharisees, and others to gain Profelytes; and therefore not to be regarded in the Quakers.

BEFORE I inform you of the Foundation-Errours of the Quakers, I think it necessary to caution you, not to be caught or imposed upon, by that demure Behaviour, and seeming Strictness, by
B which

which the *Friends* love to be distinguished, from the rest of their Neighbours; for as the *Shew* of Humility, Meekness, and Self-denial has been always apt to cheat the World; so a great many well-meaning People, have been oft deceived and put upon by the Out-side of Religion. The *Pharisees* are well-known, to have had a wonderful Interest with the People, by making a greater *Shew* of Piety and Holiness, than was to be observed in the Lives of others; They had a fairer *Form* of *Godliness*, though they wanted the *Power* of it; yet by these deluding Arts, they gained so on the Affections of the unthinking Multitude, that 'twas proverbial among them to say, That if but two went to Heaven, the one would be a *Scribe*, and the other a *Pharisee*. But for all their sanctified Looks, and outward *Au-*

Mat. 5.20. *sterities*, our Saviour tells us, *Except our Righteous exceed the Righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, that we shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* The false Apostles and Teachers in the very beginning of Christianity, were main Sticklers about Strictness, and greater Severities of Life, than were usually practised in the best and purest of the Christian Churches. And it has been observed by learned Men, that there were scarce any of those, who are mention'd, as the Authours of great Mischief to the Church of Christ; (as appears by the *Gnosticks*, the *Ebionites*, *Marcion*, *Montanus*, *Manichæus*, and others;) but were remarkable, for something out of the way, as a Badge of more than ordinary Sanctity. Thus you see specious Pretences, and the Appearance of a greater Zeal and Godliness, have been old and stale Artifices, made use of by Deceivers in all Ages, the more easily to convey their Errors into the Minds of their deluded Followers. The *Quakers* also have found even their outward Austerities and precise Contempt and Omission of the common Customs and Usages of the World, turn to Account; solemn Looks and set Phrases,

different

different Habits, and an odd way of Address, are things out of the common Road; and tho' these matters are in themselves the most ridiculous Follies, yet what strange impressions do such Trifles make, on the Minds of weak and injudicious Persons? Do but fantasie then the *Friends* stripped of these goodly Ornaments, and they would not be taken notice of in the World. Let them but speak and be habited like other People, and use the same Expressions of Civility and good Manners, and you'll see ~~nothing~~ remarkable in their Lives from your selves or others whom out of their great Charity, they are pleased to call *Carnal* and *Worldly* Christians. And therefore that they might be valued and esteemed, as wiser and holier than the rest of Mankind, what a deal of Noise and Disturbance have they raised, about what they call the *pure* and *plain* Language? What out-cries against the ways and traditions and customs of the World? As though Religion consisted in Modes of Speech, or in a sullen Separation from the decent Fashions and Habits of the Country where we live! These are such idle Impertinencies, not worth the deliberation of one single thought; but least they should amuse any of you, that don't well understand these matters; and that you may know how to answer the *Quakers*, when they defend such absurd Practices, I will undergo the *Drudgery* for once, of giving them a particular Examination.

S E C T. II.

Their Scruples about Thee and Thou proved to be childish and trifling, and of no consequence in Religion.

AND in the first place I will begin with their famous Controversie of *theeing* and *thowing*; V. Penn's *reface to Language*; and many a delicate Harangue has been made about it. Their hearers have been oft exhorted, not to use the word *you* to a single Person, but to stick close to *thee* and *thou*, which if they neglect they are accused of *shunning* the Cross of Christ. That this is true Quaker Doctrine, is sufficiently known; and therefore to omit other Quotations, I'll prove it out of Wyeth's *Switch*, &c. p. 157. where he has these words. *If any to shun the Cross of our Lord Jesus---shall say you instead of thee and thou, such will find that Disobedience their Burthen.* What a senseless perverting the Holy Scriptures is here, to suppose the ridiculous *Whim*, of saying *thee* and *thou* and not *you*, to be any part of the Doctrine of the Cross? That a readiness to bear the Cross is a strict and indispensable Obligation laid on all Christians, is very evident: For our Saviour makes this, the great Mark of a true Disciple. *If any man (says he) will be my Disciple, let him deny himself, and take up his Cross, and follow me.* Now hear Wyeth's Comment. "If any will not shun the Cross of our Lord Jesus, let him not please the vain mind, in saying *you* instead of *thee* and *thou*, but let him keep to the pure and plain Language. This is the Quakers taking up the Cross and following Christ! Here's bantring and ridiculing our Saviour's Doctrine, rather than expounding it; for by taking up the Cross is certainly meant,

Mat. 16.
24.

meant, our willingness to leave any of the Enjoyments, or Conveniencies of Life, to suffer any Contumelies or Reproaches, nay to part with our Lives, for the sake of Christ, and his Religion. Now what's all this to the using the word *you* to a single Person? Or how comes sticking close to *thee* and *thou* to be parting with our worldly Interest for the sake of Christ? Or how can keeping to the *Quaker's* plain Language, be ever interpreted, suffering for the Christian Religion? They pretend the Scriptures cannot be understood, but by the *same Spirit* that gave them forth; yet if this be the Effects of the *Spirit's* interpretation, - a little common Sense is beyond the *Quaker's spiritual Gifts*: For no Man that is not given up to the Delusions of *Quakerism* can imagine *theeing* and *thouing* to be bearing the Cross. And to make this more plain, you must know, that the *Quakers* having always made such a deal a-do about this childish Scruple, gave occasion to an ingenious Person pleasantly to ask them, *whether there is any Immorality or Iniquity in these Letters, Y. O. U. more than in T. H. O. U?* Which *Wyeth* says is a foolish Question; however it has produced a very wise Answer; for he goes on and tells his *sober Reader*, that the Alphabet cannot have Immorality or Iniquity in the Letters. Yet *whosoever* in evil mind, by joining them does express words either Blasphemous or Profane --- of these men do pronounce accordingly, i. e. that the Letters of the Alphabet, merely as Letters, are very harmless and innocent things; but if a man be wickedly disposed, and puts these same Letters something villainously together, they may prove of very dangerous Consequence. Now how this notable Discovery comes to pass for an Answer, can only be gueſt at by a *Quaker's* understanding; and therefore we shall examine what they have to say to another Question proposed to them by the same Authour, *viz. whether every Nation be not Master of its own Language?* But this is such a wise

Snake in the Grass
2d Edit.
p. 85.
Switch,
p. 157.

p. ibid.

one, that the *switch* passes it over, without taking any notice on't, and he was surely much in the right; for can any man in his Senses deny this? Yet upon this single point, does all this learned Controversie depend; which is so confessed and acknowledged a Truth, that it will not bear a Dispute. To apply this then, if the Custom of *England* has by long Usage, made the word *you* both of a singular as well as plural Signification, then it follows, that we may thus very lawfully use it; unless the *Quakers* can prove, that God has any where forbidden *you* to be used in both Numbers. What they may do out of *Fox's Journal* I will not affirm, but you may be pretty confident, they can never prove it out of the Bible. But the *Friends* may tell you, that if it be not unlawful, yet it's more proper to say *thee* and *thou*, than *you* to a single Person. Thus you see this rare Case of Conscience is at last dwindled into a Grammar nicety; but if Impropriety of Speech must be accounted a Sin, I doubt many of the *Friends* will enjoy but a Fool's Paradise; for tho' they are all great pretenders to the Spirit, yet I never could learn that they had the *Gift of Tongues*. But if these *Quaker-Criticks* are so conscientiously nice, that they dare not use *you* to a single Person, for fear of speaking improperly by confounding the Numbers; (*a very sad business!*) You may ask them, why they are not as tenderly cautious not to jumble the *Cases*; for doubtless the one is as grand an Heresie, as the other. And yet it has been observed, that they make no conscience in putting the *Accusative*, for the *Nominative Case*; as, How dost *thee* do, wilt *thee* go, &c. And therefore if these mighty Casuists make impropriety of Speech to be a Crime; they are certainly greater Offenders than we are in saying *you* to a single Person; which we affirm by the Custom of the Country may very properly be used either in the singular or plural Number. And it would be no great difficulty to show

show you, that the *Quakers* in several other instances have made little Scruple of Conscience in transgressing the Rules of Grammar.

But after all, what do these men mean to trouble themselves and others about such very ridiculous matters? Must a man be in a State of Damnation, if he does not know how to distinguish the Numbers? Does the Salvation of Souls depend on the Grammarians Art? And yet there is not one *Quaker* in twenty, (to speak modestly) that can distinguish betwixt a *Noun* and a *Verb*; nor knows any more of *Numbers*, than of *Gerunds* and *Supines*; yet there are the men, (*Forsooth*) that dare not say *you* to a single Person, because it is not proper! This is such a senseless doting about *Questions* and *Strife of Words*, that I Tim.6.4 believe all mankind can show nothing like it. And though the *Quakers* pretend to be guided by an infallible Light, yet it's very plain to all but themselves, that they are bewildred in their own Imaginations about Trifles and Matters of no Moment.

SECT. III.

Fox's Orders about unnecessary Buttons,&c. and the Quakers Conceits about their Habits and Dresses, the Effects of a gross and unaccountable Superstition.

WHICH will still farther appear, if you consider the *Friends* are as nicely scrupulous about the Habits and Customs of the Countrey, as they are about the Forms of Speech. And *George Fox* the Founder of *Quakerism*, though he never was so complaisant as to doff his Hat to his Betters, yet he was Grand Master of the *Quaker-Ceremonies*;

Vid. an or-
der of
Fox's prin-
ted in,
Christia-
nity no
Enthusi-
asm.

Rom. 12.2.

Joh 7.24.

remonies ; and adjusted their Cloths, and Manner of Address as well as their Words : For he gave out rare Orders about *unnecessary Buttons*, *skimming-dish Hats*, &c, and was very diligent in instructing his Followers in these and such like essential Points of his Religion. This Order against *unnecessary Buttons*, must be granted to be a very frugal Injunction, and is usually observed by the *Country Friends* ; and believe it not without great Reason, for why should they wear more *Buttons* than they have real use for ? The *Friends* also are as careful not to disobey his Orders, which he made against *slit peaks* behind on the *Skirts* of their *Wastcoats*, *short Sleeves* and *short black Aprons*, and a deal of such Trumpery, which he and all his Followers, have severely inveighed against as the vain Fashions of the World. And mighty Scruples have been raised about these matters, not only from *Fox's Authority*, which they never dare disobey, but also from Scripture ; for does not the Apostle, (say the *Friends*) command us not to be *conformed to this World* ? But if they would mind the plain meaning, as well as the Words of *St. Paul*, they might easily understand that this is nothing at all to their purpose ; for it immediately follows, but *be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds* ; observe, it's a new mind and the transforming of the heart, not new Looks or Habits, or an odd Dreis, or any Singularity in our Carriage, (as the *Quakers* dream) that Christianity requires. And therefore it's a great Violation of Charity, and not *judging righteous Judgment*, to condemn all without distinction, as guilty of Pride and Vanity, for wearing only a little Ribbon, or some of that same thing, (*O abomination of abominations*) called Lace. As tho' Pride may not be shrowded under a *mob'd black Hood* ! A well drest Head is no surer a Sign of a carnal Mind, than a Bob crevat and a Coat with a few Buttons, are the certain Badges of an humble and true Christian Spirit. A proud heart is

is that, which God abhors, and who knows not, that this may lurk in a plain Dress, or be covered with a homely Garment, as well as under the most fashionable Apparel. I would not be understood by this to justify the Fantastick Dresses, and Modish Vanities of our Modern *Beaus*, even of both Sexes; but would only vindicate the unconcerned and unaffected Compliance of sober and vertuous Persons with the decent Habits, and if you will, fashions of the Age, from the rude Assaults of a company of proud and morose Cynicks; as though those who have not their Cloths made and hanged on after their awkward Fashion, were guilty of breaking a Divine Command.

The *Friends* are so far from being either better Men or more spiritual Christians, for their odd and affected Singularities, that a conscientious scrupling these indifferent Matters are really the Effects of a gross and unaccountable Superstition: Which always arises from dishonourable and unworthy Thoughts of God; and from false and mistaken Principles in Religion. For what a great Contempt and Reproach do we cast on the Divine Majesty, if we think to court and please him with our Dresses or Modes of Speech, or such like inconsiderable Fancies? What strange Notions must men have of the great Creator of the World, if they can suppose him so poor and mean a Being, as to be either appealed or offended with those things, which he has neither forbidden nor commanded? Nothing surely can recommend us to the Favour of God, but an Universal Righteousness and Holiness of Heart and Life? Serve God and love your Neighbour, look well to the inward frame and disposition of your Minds; govern your Passions, be peaceable, modest and humble, &c. in short, mind the main substantial Parts of Religion, and I shall never trouble you about such *Quaker*-trifles as your Habits and Dresses or Buttons of your Coats. For I am much of the same mind as to these matters with

Vallis of
the Chri-
tian Sab-
bath, p. 68.

with a Grave Divine, who living in the late times, and being asked why he did not preach against *Long-hair*, (which was in those Days more offensive than 'tis now) gave this Answer; If he could but Preach *Jesus Christ* into their *Hearts*; he should not much concern himself for their *Hair*. Do not therefore neglect the *weightier* things of the Law, and you shall never hear much from me about the *Mint* and the *Cummin*. Who-ever starts Objections about such Niceties is endeavouring to enslave us with the Jewish Bondage and Mosaical Severities under the Pretence of Christian Liberty. Our *beloved* Saviour was not distinguished, as the proud *Pharisees* were, from the rest of the Jews in every little Circumstance, or Custom of humane Life. He despised their ridiculous Conceits of Holiness, and frequently declaimed against their seeming Rigours and affected Austerities; he did not place any part of his Religion, in scrupling the received Customs and decent Manners of those, with whom he was pleased to converse; he was singular in nothing but Innocency; he did not come into the World, with a sour Look and a fallen Countenance; he was not remarkable for a stiff Carriage, or a starch'd Behaviour; these were the Fopperies, which the *Pharisees* then, as our *Quakers* now, wonderfully doted on and admired: But the Holy Jesus was free and easie and affable in his Conversation; in a word just like the rest of the World, Sin only excepted, and therefore they contemned and reproached his Person, and would not embrace his Doctrine. From all which we may safely conclude, that a modest Compliance with the decent Fashions and comely Ceremonies of Address and Conversation; that Courtesie, Civility, and good Manners, are always consistent with the true Principles of the Christian Religion.

SECT. IV.

The Quakers refusing to take off their Hats to their Superiours and Magistrates as a Mark of Respect, made appear to be an Offence against the Laws of God and Man; and obliging their Apprentices and Servants to give to themselves this very Mark of Respect which they deny to others, is such a Practice that never can be reconciled with their Principles.

WHAT I have already said is enough to expose, that rude and clownish Deportment of the *Quakers* towards their Betters in denying all civil Respect. This though it be a great Badge of their Religion, yet is what our Saviour and his Apostles never taught or practised. For Respect and Reverence to our Superiours are Gospel-Precepts, as is plain from Scripture; for we are there expressly commanded, to give Honour to whom honour is due, and in honour to prefer one another, &c. Rom. 13.7
Ro. 12.10 If then the Custom of the Country does require as for instance the taking off the Hat, as a mark or token of that respect, which is due by the Laws of our Religion, who-ever refuses thus to take it off, offends both against the Laws of God and Man. For Disrespect and Irreverence to those above us are really levelling Principles, and like *Drink* make the Peasant equal with a Lord; dissolve all good Order and Government, and turn all into Confusion. What's more ridiculous than to see a little puny *Quaker* strutting it with his Hat on, in the Face of Authority, as if he himself was, as their *Friend Deansberry* words it,

it, *one of the Men in Commission to do Justice* ? A very goodly Sight ! And doubtless mainly gratifying the Ambition of every conceited Enthusiast, to be exempted, as a Child of Light, from giving Honour or paying Civility to the Children of the World. This he thinks makes him look big in the Eyes of his Neighbours ; and must needs be very pleasing to a proud Spiritualist, to fanſie himſelf upon the level with his Superiours ; as though *forſooth* he muſt be ſomething more than ordinary, becauſe he has the ill Manners to be rude and uncivil to his Betters ! But the Quakers pretend, though they *don't uſe the Ceremony of the Hat, yet they pay Honour, to whom Honour is due.* But why don't they pay that Honour which is required ? If they acknowledge Honour to be due, then they are obliged to pay it ; how come they then to ſcruple the manner of paying it ? It muſt be according to the Cuſtom of the Country, as has been well obſerved, or we don't pay it at all. Suppoſe a man ſhould have refuſed the laſt year his 2 s. in the Pound, and yet at the ſame time allow, that he ought to pay Tribute to whom Tribute is due, only he ſcruples paying it according to the Statute ; don't you think he would be accounted and puniſhed as an Offender ? This is juſt ſuch a jeſt of the Quakers, they do not deny you ſee Honour and Civility to be due to Superiours, yet they obſtinately reſuſe to give that reſpect which is required, and is no where forbidden : But what tolerable Reason, they can give for this, I profeſs, I never could underſtand. However the *Light within* expreſſly forbids them to pull off their Hats, as Wyeth terms it in Ceremony or Civility, and there's an end of the buſineſs. But here as well as in ſeveral other matters it proves but a blind Guide ; for they require this very Token of Reſpect themſelves, which they out of Conſcience, as is pretended, dare not give to others. This perhaps may ſurprize ſome of the Underlings, who have never heard any thing of

Wyeth's
Appendix,
p. 50.

Defence of
the Snake.

Appendix,
p. 50.

of the matter; yet it's notoriously known, that the *Friends* oblige their Apprentices to stand bare-headed in their Shops; and their Servants also must stand *Cap* in hand before them; nay, their pety Schoolmasters expect all their Scholars to show them that Honour and Respect, which they scorn to give to the greatest Prince in Christendom. And if this be not gross Hypocrisie, there is no such thing in the World. For how can any have the Confidence to exact that from others, which they scruple to do themselves? The *Friends* are so squeamish, truly, that they are afraid to put off their Hats, in the Presence of their Betters; yet they make no Conscience of receiving this Honour from their own Servants! Don't you think Superiours and Magistrates ought to have as much Respect and Reverence from the *Quakers*, as their very Apprentices and Scholars are forced to pay to themselves? This plainly proves them to be self-condemned, and their Principles and Practices are in this particular so very inconsistent, that they never can be reconciled. And the Mystery of it is only this, as they have already been told, that they will receive Honour, though they will not pay it; just like the zealous Brother who was a great Enemy to *Christmas*-pies, as a dangerous and superstitious sort of Food, yet his Neighbour hapning to send him one, he presently fell too, only with this Grace; that if there was any Sin in't, that it might be imputed to the Giver, and not to the Receiver. This instance to some may perhaps seem a little too trivial, yet being so exactly agreeable to the *Quaker*-Practices, I hope it may without any Offence be inserted. For the *Friends* are never against receiving Respect; nay you see, they force their Inferiours to pay it, but they would not for the World give any themselves! Yes, and will receive Titles too, for who ever heard a *Quaker*-Grandee refused to answer, when he was called Master? But if there be any Sin ei-
ther

thcr in Respect or Titles, let it be imputed to the Givers, and not to the Receivers, and then the *Quakers* are safe enough; for though they'll receive them both, you can never catch them at paying either. Nay, *G. Fox* himself did assume such glorious Titles of Respect and Honour, and has received such extraordinary Marks of *Worship*, which were never paid to any other man in the World; which will plainly appear by the two following Sections.

S E C T. V.

Fox blasphemously called himself, The Son of God; and the Quakers have lately defended him in this, consequently are guilty of Blasphemy themselves.

NOW for the Proof of this, I shall only instance in that Answer which he gave to *Oliver Cromwell* that he would not fight with the Carnal Sword, which begins thus, *viz. I who am of the World called George Fox do deny the carrying or drawing of any carnal Sword against any, or against thee Oliver Cromwell, or any man, in the presence of the Lord God I declare it, God is my witness, by whom I am moved to give this forth, for the Truths sakes, from him, whom the World calls George Fox, Who is The Son of God, who is sent to stand a Witness against all Violence:*

Appendix
to *White-
head's An-
tidote*, p. 4.

This Letter was mentioned in that *Venomous Piece of Villainy* as the *Quakers* call the Snake in the Grass; but the Switch has no mind to own it, and says, p. 175. *it may either be adulterated by the Snake, or some Apostate, or forged by them.* Thus the *Quakers* Answer in distress! But this is only a help at a dead lift; for how can it be for-
ged,

ged, since it is particularly taken notice of in Fox's P. 137. *Journal*? And I have also a Copy of this very Letter by me, which any of you may peruse, and it was transcribed long since by a Quaker, and agrees exactly with that which is Printed out of Norton's Manuscript at the end of the Defence of the Snake; now that it has been adulterated I grant, but then it was by the Quakers themselves, for it is strangely curtail'd and mangl'd in the *Journal*; the Editors of it having left out, [Who is the Son of God;] They were sensible of the horrible Blasphemy of this, and several other such like Expressions, (though that Fox spoke was from the Mouth of the Lord) and therefore they endeavoured to hide them from the World, but that you see cannot be done; however here was a little cunning, though not much honesty, in that they had some regard to the Honour of their Founder, and would not expose him for a Blasphemer. But Wyeth he ventures at all, and P. 16. has the Face to tell the World, that the Editors of the *Journal* had no Reason why they should have left out those words [Who is the Son of God] which need not have given offence if they had been in. How! No Reason! Why was George Fox The Son of God! We read, Luke 1. 35. that the Angel told the Virgin Mary, the Holy Ghost should over-shadow her, and therefore that Holy Thing, which should be born of her, should be called the Son of God. The Jews were so sensible that this mighty Honour belonged only to the promised Messiah, that they accused even our Blessed Saviour of Blasphemy on this very Account, because he called himself the Son of God. They charged him with this, as appears by his own words, John 10. 36. Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the World, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God? And the Jews urged this owning of himself to be the Son of God, as a Reason, why he should be crucified, John 19. 7. We have a Law, and by our Law he ought

ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God. Though the Jews were in this guilty of the highest Blasphemy, in thus accusing our Blessed Saviour, who really was in the strictest and most proper Sense the Son of God; yet thus far they reasoned a-right, that for any to call himself thus, that was not so, was a sufficient proof of his being a wretched Impostor, and a horrid Blasphemer. How durst then this profane Fox assume to himself so glorious a Title, and impudently send word to *Oliver*, that he was the Son of God? And who but the *Quakers* would justify such Impiety, and brazen it out that he might be called so *without any offence*? Nay more, if I can make it evident, that Fox's Followers and Admirers have given to him, that Honourable Name which is only due to our Blessed Lord; and have Ador'd and Worshipp'd him, calling him the *King of Israel*; I hope it will be granted, that this is a little more respect than taking off the Hat, and giving civil Titles.

SECT. VI.

Of the Idolatrous Practices of the Quakers in worshipping G. Fox, proved from undeniable Instances; which they can neither confute nor deny, as is plain from their guilty Excuses in the Switch for the Snake.

BEING now to give you an Account of Matter of Fact, the only proof here must be from the Testimony of those, who actually saw these *Quaker-Adorations*; and therefore to give you satisfaction in this, I shall make use of the words of

of

of an Authentick Authour, who tells us, " That
 " he had it from Eye-witnesses, who have seen *Snake in*
 " the *Quakers* fall down to G. Fox, and saying *the Grass,*
 " to him, *Thou art the Son of the Ever-living* 2d. Edit.
 " *God, the King of Israel, All Nations shall wor-* p. 114.
 " *ship thee, &c.* And kneeling to his Wife *Marg-*
 " *aret*, gave her an *Ora pro nobis* in these Words,
 " *O thou my Heavenly Mother, Pray to my Hea-*
 " *venly Father for me.* These Adorations were
 " common to G. Fox. And that Blasphemous
 " *Vulpone* took it gravely without any reprehension;
 " but on the contrary with *Delectation*,
 " stroaking his Hand over ^{as} *their* Faces, (as his
 " Custom was,) who *kneele* or *fell prostrate* be-
 " fore him. But because the *Friends* call always
 " for an *Instance*, though the Case be never to
 " common; I will, to oblige them, go a great
 " way back; and name *Ann Gargil*, who when
 " G. Fox came first to London, threw her self up-
 " on her Knees, betwixt his Feet; and cried out
 " to him, *Thou art the Son of the Living God!*
 " S. B. another *Quaker*, now alive, was present;
 " and confesses she was struck with that Blasphemous
 " Expression. Thus far my Authour: And
 " least the *Quakers* should pretend these are Stories
 " raised to slander Truth and its *Friends*, you must
 " know, that all they can say in excuse of these
 " plain Instances of their Idolatrous Practices is on-
 " ly this; viz. *I do here charge the Snake*, says *Wy-* Switch,
 " *eth*, with a notorious Lye, in saying that G. Fox did p. 182.
 " with *Delectation* ever accept of any Adoration, or
 " to be stiled King of Israel, &c. or that his Wife ac-
 " cepted of any such *Ora pro nobis*, as above; or
 " that it was given by any in true Unity with us.
 " Now this seems rather a Confession than Denial of
 " the Fact. For they cannot deny you see, that
 " Fox used to be worship'd and ador'd; *Wyeth* has
 " not a word to say against that, only that he was
 " not much pleased with it, he did not take much
 " delight in his Adorations: But how came he then
 " to stroke his Hand over the Faces of those who

fell prostrate at his Feet? What! Was this any sign or Mark of his displeasure? Was this Frowning on his Worshippers, and letting them know, that he did not receive Divine Honour with *Delectation*? This stroaking their Faces was a terrible way of expressing his Anger; yet the *Friends* cannot deny this to have been his usual Custom of reprimanding his Adorers; Let any Man judge then, if he did not accept of those Blasphemous Titles, and Idolatrous Adorations with *Delectation*. But after all how does this clear *Fox* from being worshipt as the Son of God? Here you see is a home Charge, that he *was* Adored by the *Quakers*; that *Ann Gargil* in particular threw her self upon her Knees betwixt his Feet, and cryed out to him, *Thou art the Son of the living God!* That *S. B.* another *Quaker*, (alive when the *Snake* was writing) was actually present, and confessed, she was struck with that Blasphemous Expression. Now What says *Wyeth* to this? Why truly not one word; he never so much as takes the least notice of this instance of *Gargil*; but only as you have heard, cries out of the *Snake*, and says it's a *lye*, a notorious *lye*, that *Fox* did with *Delectation* ever accept of any Adoration. Not a syllable to disprove the matter of Fact; and therefore the Charge of Blasphemy stands good against them. 2dly. Their excuse for *Margaret* is the same with *George's*; (*What's Sauce for a Goose is Sauce for a Gander.*) They have nothing to say against the *Eye witnesses*, that actually saw the *Quakers* kneeling to this same *Margaret*, and said unto her, *O thou my Heavenly Mother, Pray to my Heavenly Father for me!* But have only this poor come off that she did not accept of any such *Ora pro nobis*; But they do not offer the least shadow of an argument to Satisfie the World, that she did not accept it. However *Wyeth* suspecting this will pass but for a shuffle has another excuse ready, viz. That this *Ora pro nobis* was not given by any in true uni-

ty wish them; Now he seems to confess the Fact, only that she was not *Worship'd* by one of their own Party. But this must also be a notorious Falshood; for the separate *Quakers* were always so averse from Praying to *Fox's* Wite as their *Heavenly Mother*; that they would not acknowledge *George* for their *Heavenly Father*. And his *usurping* so great an Authority over his Followers as it he had been their *Heavenly Father* indeed, was the true reason, why many of the sincerer *Quakers* divided from *Fox* and his Gang; of which I shall hereafter give you a brief Account.

Let me now desire any of you to consider the great Modesty and wondrous Humility of these self-denying *Quakers*; They pretend to have Scruples, mighty Scruples about civil Titles and taking off the Hat; yet oblige their Servants and Scholars to stand bare in their Presence! *Fox* has blasphemously affirmed, *That the Lord forbade him to put off his Hat to any*; yet the *Friends* used to fall down and lie *Prostrate* before him! He durst not call any Man *Master*, yet acknowledged himself to be *The Son of God*! *Journal* And his Disciples called him the *Son of the living God*, and *the King of Israel*! These are Matters of Fact which the *Quakers* can neither confute nor defend. However they are very stiff as to these Points, and are resolv'd never to give honour to whom honour is due, (which you see must be payed according to the Custom of the Countrey, or we do not pay it at all:) but hope to defend their no manners from one or two places of Scripture, which I shall endeavour to clear from their gross Mistakes in the two following Sections, and then shall conclude this Chapter concerning the Practices of the *Quakers*. *P. 24.*

S E C T. VII.

Their Objection against civil Titles from Job 32. 21, 22. shewn to be frivolous and groundless ; plain Proofs from the Examples of the best Men recorded in the Old Testament, that they never scrupled giving Titles of Honour or Respect ; nor do we read of their being ever reproved for these matters ; nor were Civil Titles ever forbidden by Christ or his Apostles.

HE that considers the strange wilfulness of the *Quakers* in denying Civil Titles, would be almost apt to imagine, that they had found out some plain Texts of Scripture, where God had expressly forbidden us to give any Marks of Honour or Respect ; But upon due Examination it will appear, that there is not one word spoken against them in all the whole Bible ; yet when *Fox's* Authority fails then they flie to Scripture ; and would willingly justify their Clownish Behaviour from *Job 32. 21, 22.* which is the only place their Famous *Bathurst* urg'd against Titles and Civil Respect ; because *Elihu* said he would give no flattering Titles unto Man ; from whence they make this notable inference, That therefore they ought to give none at all ; this is a very odd way of arguing, because we ought not meanly to cringe and fawn upon our Superiours, that therefore we must be rude to them, and like the *Quakers* make no difference nor distinction in our Behaviour or Discourse betwixt the Honourable and the *Baser sort.* We find in the Holy Scriptures variety of instances, where Persons

Truth Vindicated, p.
132.

1/a. 3. 3. 5.
Acts 17. 5.

sons most remarkable for their Piety and Vertue, were giving and receiving Obedience and Titles of Respect and Honour; and we don't read that ever they were reproved or condemned for their Civility and good Manners. It would be too tedious to give you here an Account of those Instances; the places in the Margin, to name no others, will give you sufficient Satisfaction, which you may consult at your leisure. I shall only observe that *Jacob*, Gen. 33. 3, 6, 7. *bowed himself to the Ground Seven times to his Elder Brother* and calls him over and over his Lord, v. 8. *the* ^{as} *to find grace in the sight of my Lord*, v. 14. *Let my Lord, I pray thee pass over before his Servant*. Is not bowing seven times down to the Ground a greater Mark of Honour and Respect than can be payed by taking off the Hat? And yet this you see was done by a mighty Patriarch, one that was entirely devoted to the Fear of God; who had frequent Visions, God appearing to him, and telling him, that his *Name should be called no more Jacob, but Israel, for as a Prince hast thou Power with God, and with men, and hast prevailed*. What! So great and holy a Person bowing to the Ground and vainly complementing *Esau*, and telling him, he was his Lordship's Servant? The Friends I am afraid would have *Quaked* at such a sight as this; yet I hope they will not accuse *Israel* of accepting Men's Persons or of giving flattering Titles. For there was nothing more usual in those Eastern parts of the World, than for the People to bow to the Ground and lie Prostrate at the Feet of those, whom they intended to reverence. These seem to us to be extraordinary Marks of Respect and Honour; and what the Quakers be sure, would utterly condemn as unlawful yet our Saviour gave no check or restraint to the customary Civilities of the World; he took little Notice of these matters, but left them partly as he found them; and never refused to give Respect

Gen. 23. 12.
Gen. 42. 6.
Gen. 48. 12.
1 Sam. 25.
23.
1 Kings 1.
23.
1 Sam. 2.
15

Gen. 32.
28.

and civil Titles to those in Authority. And though the ceremonial Law was abolished by Christ, or indeed at his Death rather ceased or expired of it self; yet a distinction of Titles and Respects, and a decent and submissive Behaviour towards our Betters, were never accounted any of the Jewish ceremonies.

S E C T. VIII.

Their main Objection from Matt. 23. 10. proved to be as weak and insufficient as the former. The meaning of our Saviours Words, neither be ye called Masters, briefly explained. An instance of the Quakers being Masters in that very sense, expressly contrary to our Saviours Command.

THE Quakers seem to ground themselves much on the Words of our Saviour, where he has commanded us not to be called Masters, and this they think a sufficient Argument against all civil Titles; but then why do they allow their Servants to call them Masters? yes and their Children too to call them Fathers, seeing in the Verse foregoing, we are forbidden to call any man Father upon Earth? If then by these Words all civil Titles are prohibited, the Quakers must be also offenders; unless they suppose Master and Father not to be Titles of Respect; And then the Objection answers its self. But we are told, that Christ condemned the use of those Titles [Father and Master] in every sense, where there is not a true Relation by Nature or Law. How came then S. Stephen and S. Paul

Matt. 23.
10.

V. 9.

Ellwood's
Truth
prevailing
P. 43.

S. Paul to address themselves to their Persecutors with a *Men, Brethren* and *Fathers*? Will the *Quakers* pretend here was any relation by Nature or Law? I trow not. You may ask me then, what is the meaning of these words, *neither be ye called Masters*? To which I shall give you this plain and easie Answer; that they are an Hebrew Idiom, and signifie the same thing as if he had said, *be ye not Masters*, as the *Pharisees* and Jewish Doctors are, who have usurpt a tyrannical Authority over the Consciences of their Followers; by which means they are oblig'd implicitly to believe as ever they teach them, and are absolutely to rise in themselves to their Conduct, as if they were infallible. Now this is such a blind obedience that our Saviour expressly forbids his Disciples ever to require it; and such a Despotick Power that he will by no means allow them to exercise over one another, for one, says he, *is your Master, even Christ*. To illustrate this by a remarkable Instance. The *Quakers* in *Barbadoes* wholly resigned themselves up to their Teachers in these words, *Viz. I desire to give up my whole concern, if required, both Spiritual and Temporal, unto the Judgment of the Spirit of God in the Men and Women's Meetings*. This was subscribed at the first promotion by above fourscore men and Women and afterwards by a great many more.

An account of this *Barbadoes* Judgment was first published to the World by a Separate *Quaker*, and has been printed Several times since: *Babel's Builders, p. 4.* The matter of Fact I know the *Friends* cannot deny; and I mention it here only to let you see that they have given up themselves Soul and Body to the absolute Conduct and Management of their Leaders; which makes them *Masters* in that very sense, so expressly contrary to our Saviours Command: And yet they are so nicely *Scrupulous*, that they cannot call any man *Master*, which as a Title of civil Respect, is no where

A Disco-
very of
the Man
of Sin, p.
1.

where forbidden; Perhaps it may be thought, I have overlaboured these points as being only trifles not worth your notice; yet as ridiculous as they really are, you cannot but be sensible how mighty exact the *Quakers* are about these little matters, and I assure you they have laid great stress on these fooleries; For one of their leading men has charged us in the presence of the living God to be in the Doctrine of Devils, if we call *thouing* every one, not putting off the Hat before the Magistrate, and not calling men Masters, (which he says are the Commands of Christ) *trivial Observances*. But notwithstanding this terrible Rebuke, I think we may safely conclude, That if the *Friends* ever hope to please God with their *Theeing* and *Thouing*, and such indifferent Business; If they are resolved to place any Religion in a clownish Behaviour towards their Betters, or in denying them Titles of Respect; whatever proofs these may be of their being right *Quakers*, I suppose by this time it may be pretty plain to you that they are no signs of their being the best Christians.

C H A P. II.

Of the *Quakers* Principles; especially concerning their absurd Notion of the Light within; with some of ^{or} ^{as} ^{of} ^{it} mischievous Consequences.

S E C T. I.

Plain proofs out of their most approved Writings, that they differ from us and all Christians in their Principles.

HAVING in the preceding Chapter given you some account of the *Quaker* Errors relating to practice, I shall now proceed to examine some of their Principles. And in order to this I shall make use of the following method;

First, I shall make it appear, that they are quite different from those professed by the whole Christian World, and then secondly shall prove, that the main Foundation of their Religion with its consequences is utterly inconsistent with the Christian Faith. And if I can make these things out, I hope none of you will be so careless of your eternal Interest as to renounce your Christian Profession, to embrace the dangerous Errors of *Quakerism*.

First,

First, that the *Quakers* have distinguished themselves by their very Principles not only from us, but from all the Christian World. Now I would not have any of you imagine, this to be an uncharitable Surmise, or an unjust Reflection cast on the *Quakers* on purpose to render them odious; but it is what's freely and openly own'd and acknowledg'd by themselves; that their Religion is not only different from what is professed in the Church of *England*, but also in all the Churches of Christendom. This I shall prove in so many words, out of the sayings of a great Prophet and mighty Chieftain, calling them, called *Edward Burroughs*, who in the beginning of the Epistle to the Reader before the volume of his Works reprinted, 1672. After he had told the Reader that the *Quakers* Controversie against the Priests, &c. was just and equal against them all; he goes on in these words, viz. *And that we have sufficient cause to Cry against them, and to deny their Ministry, their Church, their Worship, and their Whole Religion.* He is at it again towards the latter end, and's telling the Reader how the *Priests* and *Quakers* differ; *Thou mayst* (says he) *fully perceive we differ in Doctrines and Principles; and the one thou must justifie, and the other thou must condemn, as being one clean contrary to the other in our Principles.* This Epistle we are told by *Ellis Hooks* who Collected *Burroughs's* Works, was prefixed to *Fox's Great Mystery*, &c. Published in the Year, 1659. and was now inserted with the rest of his own Works as being of a more general Concernment. But we are not only condemned in this Epistle; he says the same again, p. 416. of his Works; *And so all you Churches and Sects, by what name soever you are known in the World, you are the Seed of the Great Whore.* Now this is not only the Opinion of one of their most noted Writers, styled a Son of Thunder and Consolation, a true Prophet and faithful Servant of God; but his Works were approved and printed by the Order

Order and Care of their second Days meeting, whose peculiar Province it is to look after their Books, that nothing be published, but what is true *Quakerism*; and they were ushered into the World by the famous Testimonies of *Francis Hemgil*, *George White-head*, *Josiah Coale*, and *George Fox*, all renowned Champions in the *Quaker*-Cause. Now what *Burroughs* has here publicly declared, must either affect them as a People as they phrase it, or else it's impossible to know what they believe by their most Authentick Writings; and if they will allow their ~~own~~ ^{own}ing may be understood by their Words, it ~~as~~ ^{as} ws, That by their denying not only our *Ministry* of *Land Church*, but our *Whole Religion*, that their ~~d~~ ^dinciples are quite Different from all other Christians. And therefore it may be well worth our Inquiry, to examine what mighty Truths necessary to the Salvation of Souls the *Quakers* have discovered; for it's very evident they fancy themselves to have revealed some extraordinary Matters, wholly unknown to the Christian World till their appearance; or else how come our Doctrines and Principles, as *Burroughs* affirms, to be clean contrary one to the other? And what these are I shall shew you in the next Section.

SECT. II.

Of the Light Within; G. Fox no Instrument as the Quakers pretend in directing Men to the true Notion of it; the Orthodox and Christian Sense of the Light Within briefly stated and explained; the Church of England no Enemy to its true Christian Sense, as plainly appears from our publick Offices; the Quakers also having lately acknowledged that the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit is owned by our Church.

switch, p
17, 38.

NOW the Quakers have always endeavoured to perswade their Followers, that George Fox has made some notable Discoveries concerning the *Light Within*, of which the World was altogether Ignorant; and therefore they have told us, *That it pleased God to send forth his Servant George Fox, who was of God made an Apostle in this Age, and hath been instrumental in his hand for the directing of Thousands to the Light of Christ in Men.* This is that wonderful matter which the Quakers imagine has been revealed to them in these latter days, and upon this Account they have divided from us and all Christians. The Friends therefore having always made such a noise both in their Writings and Discourses about the Light of Christ in Men, or the *Light Within*; and having endeavoured to make a great many Ignorant and well meaning People believe, that this was never taught by any but themselves; I will set this matter in its true Light, which the Quakers have endeavoured with all their Art to confound; and will give you the true and genuine meaning of it and,

and shall shew you, that the Sound and Orthodox Notion of the *Light Within* has ever been taught in the Church of *England*; and then shall evidently prove that the *Quakers* have got into their Heads such gross Conceits about it, which though they are the main Foundation of their Religion; yet they really quite overthrow and utterly destroy the very Principles of the Christian Faith.

The meaning then of the *Light* of Christ in Men is this; that there is a Divine Principle dwelling and acting in the Souls of good Men, which so influences their Minds as to possess them with the Love and Esteem of Heaven and Heavenly things; that the inward Operation of the Blessed Spirit upon our Hearts, is the Cause of all the good that is wrought in us; that the Holy Spirit of God is never wanting to our sincere Endeavours, in assisting us, to know and obey the Laws of our most Holy Religion; and that we are not able of our selves, so much as to think one good thought; *For it is God that worketh in us*; Phil. 2. 13; *and without him we can do nothing*; and therefore we always pray that God would illuminate and sanctifie our Minds by the Spirit of Truth and Holiness, without whose Guidance and Grace, we shall never be able to find our way to a Blessed Eternity. This is in short the true Christian Sense of the *Light* of Christ in Men, or the Inspiration of his Spirit, or if you will the *Light Within*, (for I'll not Dispute about words) which fills our Minds with good Desires, and inclines our Hearts to keep God's Commands, and Enables us to perform the Will of our Blessed Redeemer. Now I appeal to all the World, whether this most necessary and indeed essential Doctrine of Christianity has not been always taught and professed in the Church of *England*; nay, let any Man but look into our Articles and Homilies, our Prayers, Liturgy and publick Offices, and into our Books
of

of Devotion, and deny this if he can. I am sure no Man that will but look into his Common-Prayer-Book, or that duly attends the Excellent Prayers and Offices of the Church, can possibly be ignorant of our Praying to God, for his exciting, preventing and assisting Grace; *i. e.* for the Inspiration of his Holy Spirit. And this great Truth has been so largely insisted on in the 22d. Section of the *Snake in the Grass*, (which I'll at any time lend you) particularly from our publick Offices of Ordination, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, &c. that Switch, p. the *Quakers* themselves are forced to acknowledge, 463. That the *Inspiration of the Holy Spirit is owned by the Church of England*. And therefore it has always been our most earnest Desire both in our publick and private Prayers, that God would inspire our Hearts with his Holy Spirit, as being sensible without his especial Grace and Assistance, nothing we can possibly perform, will ever be accepted by him. You may perceive then by this, how unjust and unreasonable the *Quakers* are in their Clamours against us, by periwading their easie and credulous Followers, (and others who are so weak to believe them,) that we have nothing but an outward Profession of Christianity amongst us; a dry sort of Doctrine, resting only on the out-sides and Formalities of Religion, little regarding the inward Operation of the Holy Spirit upon our Minds; when the contrary is so notoriously evident by the Publick, and most Authentick Acts and Declarations of the Sense of our Church.

S E C T. III.

The Quakers Notions of the Light Within shewn to be Blasphemous and Anti-Christian ; 1st. Because they have affirm'd the Light Within to be God, and have denied Him to be in Heaven. 2dly. They believe it to be Christ, not only his Spiritual appearance, but that the very Person of Christ is Within them.

THE true meaning of the *Light Within*, being thus briefly explained, I am now in the second place to examine the *Quaker* Notions about it, which I told you were utterly inconsistent with the Christian Faith. For the main of their Religion is only this ; *Follow the Light Within!* This is their whole Creed, the Sum Total of their belief ; the *Trojan Horse* that carries all the Errors of *Quakerism* in it's Belly. This fills their Writings and Books, and is generally the Subject of all their Rambling Preachments. Yet they are usually so full of Confusion and Contradictions, when they come to explain it, that it's no very easie matter to know, what they would be at, or what they mean by it. However I shall plainly make it appear, that they have taught this *Light Within* to be God, that they believe it to be the very Christ, not only his Spiritual appearance in our Hearts, which is the Belief of all the Christian World ; but that the very Person of Christ is within them, and that they think to believe in this is sufficient for Salvation without any thing else ; *i. e.* they don't lay any Stress in the Incarnation, Death and Sufferings of our Blessed Saviour, as of any necessity to have Faith in them in Order to Salvation.

First,

The Discovery of the great Enmity of the Serpent, printed 1655.

p. 13.

First, that they have suppos'd this *Light Within* to be God; this I shall shew you out of a famous Book, wrote by a very ancient Friend, one *William Deusbery*, who was accounted a great Ring-leader among the *Quakers*, and was very well known to be such in these parts of the Countrey; being but young he tells us, that a deep Sorrow seized him and he knew not what to do, that he might get acquaintance with the God of his Life; then he began to read the Scriptures,---and mourn and pray, says he, to a God I knew not where he was; but expected him without looking up towards the [Fir]mament, where my Carnal Imagination told me he was; and as I had heard those the World calls Ministers, whom I went to hear, whose words did witness with my Carnal Imagination of God, they said he was above the skies, calling it Heaven, but I felt the hand of the Lord within me. Now the Devil himself never had such a thought as this! He is very sensible there is a God in Heaven; yes! He believes and trembles! But *Deusbery* the *Quaker* says, its the Carnal Imagination of the Worlds Ministers, that witness God to be in Heaven above! A mere childish Fancy, and the Effect of a Carnal Mind, to expect a God without! Then he either thought the *Light within* was God, or else he did not believe there was a God at all. But whether the *Friends* will allow him to be an *Atheist*, or an horrid *Blasphemer*, I leave to their *Wisdoms* to determine; however he was a true *Quaker*; hear what he says of himself, *A true Testimony of him the World knows by Name, William Deusbery, and in scorn calls Quaker; who hath been by them Imprisoned in York, Darly, Leicester and Northampton, And this is his true Testimony, that God is not in Heaven above! If this be not the Spirit of Error and Delusion which posselt one of the first most zealous Assertors of the Quaker Principles, let the World judge.*

I shall

I shall now in the second place prove that the *Quakers* believe the *Light within* to be the very Christ, not only his Spiritual Appearance in our hearts, for this I told you is owned by all Christians; *i. e.* all sound Christians do really and firmly believe the Inspiration of God's Holy Spirit, as an Heavenly Influence shed upon our Minds, which is the Light of Christ in Men; but this is very far from being the *Quakers* meaning; For they have dreamt so much of Christs being within them, that they have quite lost all sense of his having any Personal Existence or being without them; and therefore have endeavoured to implant these wild Notions in the Minds of their Children, as soon as they can read, by charging them not to believe in Christ as he is in Heaven above; this is the *Quaker's* Doctrine, which *William Smith* has published in his *primer*, where discoursing about true and false Ministers, he has these expressions; Child, *But how may I then know which is true and which is false by their Words; seeing Words may be the same? Father. Why they that are false Preach Christ without, and bid People believe in him as he is in Heaven above; but they that are true Ministers they preach Christ within.* These are his Words, and I am amazed that any who call themselves Christians, should dare to pronounce those to be false Ministers, that Preach Christ without, and bid the People believe in him as he is in Heaven above. Why? Is not Jesus Christ in Heaven? And is not he the Object of our Faith? And are not the People to believe in him, as he is in Heaven above? He that do's not believe this, is so far from being a Christian, that he is a downright Infidel; and our Saviour says, *he that believeth not shall be damned.* He therefore that pretends to be a Minister of Jesus Christ, and do's not Preach to the People to believe in him as he is in Heaven above, is the Minister of Satan and Anti-Christ: yet the *Quakers* you see charge those to be false

p. 8.

Mark 16.
16.

p. 57.

Ministers who Preach Christ as he is in Heaven ! For the main foundation of their Faith is grounded on the belief only of a Christ within and this *Smith* plainly tells us in his Catechism. Q. *And is that which is within you the only Foundation upon which you stand and the Principle of your Religion?* Answer. *That of God within us is so, for we know it is Christ ; and being Christ it must needs be only and Principal: for that which is Principal, is Greatest in being ; and thus we know Christ in us to be unto us the only and the Principal, &c.* Here (as has been well observed,) they expressly disown any other Christ, than what is within them , for this they say is the only and Principal and Greatest in being, and is what they call their *Light within*. And by the way I would have you observe, that this *Smith* was heretofore well acquainted with some of your Ancestors, and by this short account of some of his Principles you may easily conclude what good Doctrine they were likely to learn from such *Quaker-Teachers*; however agreeable enough to the Religion of their Founder, who gave one of his Adversaries this Scurvy complement; *The Devil was in thee; Thou sayest, thou art saved by Christ without thee, and so hast Recorded thy self to be a Reprobate.* Now if the Quakers do not also hope to be saved by a Christ without them, I am afraid their Light or Christ within will never bring them to Heaven; And therefore whether the Devil was not rather in this *Fox* for accusing a Christian, (who firmly believed Christ's Spiritual appearance in our hearts) as a Reprobate for expecting to be sav'd by a Christ without us, I believe the *Friends* will not readily answer.

*Fox's great
Mystery.
p. 250.*

S E C T. IV.

Several Instances of the Quakers believing only in the Light or Christ within; of their denying Jesus Christ to have a Human Body now in Heaven.

BY what I have already said it appears, that the Ancient Friends have slighted and undervalued a Christ without; we need not wonder then that the modern Quakers believe only in a Christ within: And for the truth of this, I appeal to Daniel Leeds a Quaker, who has lately informed the World what Doctrine is taught among them in Pensylvania; One of them Preacht thus. *It is the Work of the Devil to cause People, that have* Dan. Leeds's Preface to a Trumpet Sounded, &c.
profest the Appearance of Christ in the Heart to respect the Person without them. Another Preached thus, I am grieved that any that have profest the Light, should now direct the Minds of People to respect him as he is now in Heaven above the Clouds: Truly (Friends) it is Delusion. This he says was complained of by one Abraham Hulings to the Quaker-Church at Burlington, and gave in a Paper with the above cited Quotations and others under his hand, desiring the Friends to censure this Doctrine. But they would not: On the Contrary they Disowned this Hulings; who was a Quaker, for opposing this Doctrine. But we need not go to our Plantations abroad to prove the Quakers Blasphemers; I am afraid, we have too many such among our selves; Mr. Keith being invited not long since by some of the Quakers into the Country, we are told met with several in his Progress that believed in nothing else but the Light within. Particularly with a she-Preacher at S. Ives in Huntingdon-shire, who ask'd him,
 D 2. what

Defence of the Snake, &c. Part I. p. 128, 129.

what Christ he Preached? He said, *The Man Jesus of Nazareth, who was Born of the Virgin, Nail'd to the Cross, &c.* She ask'd, *what was become of him?* G. K. said, *That he was gone into Heaven.* What, (said she,) *that Heaven above our Heads?* Pointing upwards, which she ridiculed: And said she knew no Christ or Heaven but within her self. Thank'd God, *That she had Bread in her own House, and Water in her own Cistern: And did not believe, that there was any thing without her could do her any Good.* And upbraided G. Keith, that he could not be content with the *Ancient Doctrine of Friends, of Faith in the Light within, as alone sufficient to Salvation:* and asked him, *if now he would have any thing else? Or would he make himself Wiser than all the Friends who had gone before?* Here's an Honest *she Friend* of the Old *Deusberry* strain; she had no Notion of the new Doctrine of a Christ without; she knew no Christ but within her self. This is the true downright *Quakerism* without trick or disguise; for to have Faith in the *Light within*, she said was the *Ancient doctrine of the Friends.* She had no doubt learnt this out of *Smith's Primer and Catechism*, and such like precious *Quaker-books*; And was of the same opinion with an He-Preacher at *Chateres* in the Isle of *Ely*, who being ask'd by Mr. Keith, *what he supposed was become of that Body which Christ took of our Nature?* Answered, *That he left it behind him, when He rose from the Dead.* And he profess'd to believe in no other Christ, but only his *light within.*

You may see by these instances, to name no others, what fit Persons these are to set up for the great Reformers of the World, who have given us such very bad proofs of their own Christianity; for these are the strange Notions of the *Light of Christ in Men*, to which *Fox* has directed Thousands; but its a shame and Scandal to Religion to hear him called an Apostle and

an Instrument in Gods Hand, who has taught such vile and Anti-Christian Doctrine. And I am really sorry, that well meaning People, (for I have that charity to believe there are many such among the *Quakers*) should be so lamentably deceived by these fatal delusions. For cannot we bleis God for Christs Spiritual Appearance in our Hearts, but we must presently with the *Quakers* banish him out of Heaven? Because he is in us by the blessed Operations and Influences of his Spirit; has he therefore no Personal being, or Existence without us? The Earth is enlightned by the Light of the Sun which is conveyed to us by it's Beams; but will any man therefore in his senses deny the Body of the Sun to be without in the Firmament? We sincerely believe that all good Christians are enlightned by a saving light which comes from Christ, and are sanctified by his Spirit in our Hearts, and this in Scripture is called Christ within us; But what then? Are we therefore to be accused of being false Ministers, for bidding the People believe in him as he is in Heaven above? Or can this be Supposed to be the Doctrine of the Gospel, that the Devil is in us, and that we are Reprobates, if we expect to be saved by a Christ Without us? If the *Quakers* will allow Jesus Christ to be in Heaven, surely he is without us; (unless they believe with Fox, that *there is no Heaven but within themselves.*) And how He then can be *within* us, but Fox's by his Grace and Spirit, the *Quakers* would do Great well to inform you: For this is the main point Mystery, in dispute betwixt us; they will not be satisfied p. 214. with the truly Christian sense of the Light of Christ in Men, or the *Light within*, as you have heard it already explained: but dream of Christs being within them after such a manner as to exclude him having any Personal Existence without them: And thus fancying themselves by these wild Notions to be more than ordinary Christians, they have most certainly lost the very Ob-

Luk. 24.
39.

ject of the Christian Faith, viz. The Man Christ Jesus; whom they will not allow to have now a Human Body in Heaven. For discoursing very lately with a Quaker-Preacher, who has been for these several years one of the Members of their yearly Meeting at London, I asked him, whether he did believe the Body of Jesus Christ which rose from the Dead to be now in Heaven? He replied, *he was passive, and that he would not answer me*; And though at last he was forced to yield to this, yet in effect he plainly denied it, for he would by no means acknowledge, that Christ appeared to Thomas in a Body of *Flesh and Bones*; notwithstanding I urged to him our Saviours express words to his Disciples, *Behold my Hands and my Feet, that it is I my self, handle me and see, for a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones, as ye see me have*. But this would not Convince him, for he said, *he did not believe Christ had a Human Body now in Heaven*. This is the Quakerism these men have learn'd and teach to others; which clearly discovers their great Infidelity: for by denying the Humanity of Jesus Christ, it plainly follows that they do not believe him to be both God and Man. And therefore what sort of Christians the Friends are, that have so strangely bewilder'd themselves about Christ's being within them so as to deny him to be now without us in Heaven in his true Proper Human Nature, I leave to any person of common understanding to determine.

S E C T. V.

The Sufficiency of the Light Within to Salvation without something else, i. e. without Faith in an Outward Jesus, a mere Quaker Dream, and expressly contrary to the whole Tenor and Design of the Gospel: The Case of Cornelius and the Heathen in general briefly stated and considered. The Quakers Preaching altogether inconsistent with their Notions of the Sufficiency of the Light.

THE *Quakers* having as you see thus doated on their *Light Within*, you must know, that they do not believe there is any necessity to have Faith in Jesus Christ, who died at *Jerusalem*: This is notoriously evident, since their late Quarrels and Divisions among themselves in *America*, which arose from Mr. *Keith's* Preaching up Faith in an Outward Christ as well as the *Light Within*: And this so alarm'd the *Friends*, that they damn'd this Christian Doctrine as Heresie, and said, this was preaching up two Christs, a Christ Without and a Christ Within; and in short, were all Rage and Fury against him because he taught the *Light Within* not to be sufficient to Salvation without something else. That this is the true ground of all their Clamour and Noise against Mr. *Keith*, G. *Whitehead* himself shall be judge, who has declar'd, That the main reason of the *Quakers* being offended at him was for his undervaluing the *White-Light within* as not sufficient to Salvation, or not head's sufficient without something else. Now what was it that Mr. *Keith* meant by this something else? Why, he has told the *Quakers* over and over,

D 4

that

that he meant the man Christ Jesus, whose most precious Blood was outwardly shed for the Remission of Sins; and therefore he preacht the necessity of Faith in Christ's Death and Sufferings, his Resurrection, Ascension, and Intercession for us in Heaven. If the *Quakers* then, as is plain from *G. Whitehead's* own words, have been offended at Mr. *Keith* for undervaluing the *Light within* as not sufficient to Salvation, or not sufficient without something else: And if by this something else he has ever meant Faith in an Outward Christ, which is the great and fundamental Article of the Christian Religion, then it follows, that the *Quakers* do not believe, there is any necessity to have Faith in Jesus Christ without us, as he died and suffered for us, &c. in order to our Salvation. And you may assure your selves, whoever asserts this, endeavours to frustrate the great End of our Saviour's coming into the World; and renders his Sufferings and Dying for us, to be altogether needless and insignificant. For what reason can the *Quakers* give, why an *Angel* should command

Acts 10. 3. *Cornelius* to send to *Toppa* for the Holy Apostle

5. 6. *St. Peter*, to tell him what he ought to do, whereby

Acts 11. he and all his House should be saved, if the *Light*

14. within was sufficient to Salvation without any thing else? That this famous *Gentile* followed the *Light within*, the *Friends* cannot deny; for we are

Acts 10. 2. told, that he was a devout Man, and one that feared God, and gave much Alms to the People, and prayed to God alway; and that his Prayers and Alms were come up for a Memorial before God. V. 22.

4.

that he was a just man, and of good Report among all the Nations of the Jews. And yet you see all these excellent Qualifications would not do, without his being instructed in the Christian Faith; and therefore *St. Peter* informed him, v. 38. How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with Power, who went about doing good, and healed all that were oppressed of the Devil; for God was with him, v. 39. And we are Witnesses of all things

things which he did, both in the Land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem, whom they slew and hanged on a Tree, v. 40. Him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly, v. 41. Not to all the People, but unto Witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him, after he rose from the Dead, v. 42. And he commanded us to preach unto the People, and testify that it is he, which was ordain'd of God, to be the Judge of Quick and Dead, v. 43. To him give all the Prophets witness, that through his Name whosoever believeth in him shall receive Remission of Sins. Now let any sincere and well-disposed Quaker, but attentively consider this, and try if they can justify their Leaders, for teaching the Light within to be sufficient to Salvation without something else? We don't hear a word of the Apostle's bidding Cornelius follow the Light within, and hearken to that; no such matter, he bids him have Faith in Jesus of Nazareth for Remission of Sins; that same Jesus whom the Jews hang'd on a Tree, and to whom all the Prophets gave witness, &c. for there is no Salvation, says the same Apostle, in any other; neither is there any other Name under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved. How God Almighty will deal with those, who never heard of the Gospel, is what he has never yet been pleased to reveal to the World; and therefore it's a great presumption for any to tell him how he ought to deal with them. "Tho' St. Paul seems plainly to intimate, that Men cannot be bound to believe, and by consequence cannot be punished, for not believing, unless the Gospel is preached to them. For how can they call on him, says the Apostle, in whom they have not believed? And how can they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how can they hear without a Preacher? Let none therefore damn those, who never could (morally speaking) be instructed in the Faith of Jesus of Nazareth; they are in the Hands of a Merciful Creator and Saviour of Mankind,

Acts 4. 12

Rom. 10.

14.

Mankind, and there we ought to leave them, without passing our rash Censures concerning their Eternal State. But the Case of the Heathens is quite different from those, who have the means and opportunity of knowing and embracing the Christian Religion, yet cannot be persuaded of the necessity of Faith in an Outward Christ, who suffered at *Jerusalem* in order to their Salvation. If *Cornelius* had refus'd to have been instructed in the Faith of a Crucified Saviour; Had he despised and rejected Jesus of *Nazareth*, whom the *Jews* slew and hanged on a Tree, and had told St. *Peter* that it was enough for him to believe in the *Light within*, and follow that, without troubling himself about any thing else; I think we may very safely conclude, that his being a just and a charitable person would never have sav'd him. For all that live under the Gospel, that is, all that have the means of Salvation proposed to them of God's sending his Son into the World to save Sinners, are bound to believe Jesus to be Christ the Son of God and Saviour of the World, and that upon pain of *Damnation*.

John 8.24. If ye believe not that I am he, (says our Saviour to them, to whom the Gospel was propos'd) ye shall die in your sins: He that believeth not the Son of

John 3.36. God, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth

John 4.3. on him. Every Spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God, but is the Spirit of Antichrist. If any man will but read over seriously these and a hundred other places of Scripture that might be produced to the same purpose, he cannot but acknowledge, (unless he be fatally byass'd by the Spirit of *Quakerism*) that there is something else required to make us Christians, besides believing in the *Light within*; yes! if ever we hope to enjoy a Blessed Eternity, we must have a sincere and unfeigned Faith in that Jesus of *Nazareth*, whom the *Jews* slew and

Acts 10.39. hanged on a Tree, &c. And tho' this be a Stumbling-block to the *Jews*, and unto the *Greeks* Foolish-

ness; yet this Blessed Jesus is the most adorable Object of our Faith, whom all Orthodox Christians worship as their Sovereign Lord and Redeemer. For this is he whom God commanded the *Apostles to preach unto the People, and testify that he was the promised Messiah, who was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead; and that through his Name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.* But the Quakers take little notice of this: They were never heard to preach up the Necessity of Faith in a Crucified Jesus! This is a Stumbling-block to the Quakers as well as to the Jews; and therefore they don't expect to be sav'd by Faith in an Outward Christ; but they believe Christ is nothing but a Principle dwelling in them, and this they call the *Light within*; and if they do but hearken to and obey that, they think all's well enough, and they have no need to mind any thing else. *Let us but soberly consider,* Address says Mr. Penn, *what Christ is, and we shall the Protestants better know, whether Moral Men are to be reckoned Christians.* What is Christ, says he, but Meekness, Justice, Mercy, &c? Here's the Quaker's Christ, a moral Habit, or a Principle of Vertue! He goes on, *can we then deny a meek man to be a Christian?* Yes! no doubt of it, for besides practising Moral Vertues, we must also believe Jesus Christ to be both God and Man; and must of necessity have a living Faith in his Blood, which was outwardly shed as the full Atonement and Satisfaction to the Justice of God, for our Sins. And the Quakers have been frequently told, that as far as any one is from this Faith, so far he is from Christianity; and therefore all our good Qualities, or as we usually say, our being good moral men, without Faith in an Outward Christ will never bring us to Heaven. How then can the Quakers call themselves Christians, and yet think the *Light within* to be sufficient to Salvation without any thing else? This in short is downright Deism and no Christianity, but yet being an avow'd

A&T. 10. 45

43.

Address to the Protestants p. 119.

avow'd Principle of *Quakerism*, the Consequence is plainly this, That the *Quakers* are *no Christians*; because their Notions of the *Light within* are utterly destructive of the very Foundation of the Christian Faith, and expressly contrary to the whole tenor and design of the Gospel. Before I finish this Head, I would observe to you, That the Practices of the *Quakers* in several Instances (as I could easily shew you) are altogether inconsistent with their Fancies about the Sufficiency of the *Light*; but I shall at present only take notice of their outward Preaching, Declaring, or whatever they call it, and this according to the Notion they have of the *Light*, must be altogether useless and unnecessary. For you may ask them, why they do pretend to preach, if the *Light within* be sufficient? Does the *Light* want any Instruction? Or do they intend to inform that? If they tell you, that they only give their Testimony, as they sometimes phrase it, that their *Friends* should follow and be guided by the *Light*: Ask them again, if this does not suppose, that the *Light* either cannot or will not teach them their Duty, as well as they can themselves? and then let them answer, whether or no it be sufficient without any thing else. They say indeed they are all taught of God; yet we see in Fact, how fond they are of being taught by men; or else why do they erect Meeting-houses, and trudge many a Mile* to them to hear their Teachers? Why do they cry up the sufficiency of the *Light*, and run down outward Teaching, when at the same time there are none that practise it more than themselves. They have in these Parts within the compass of 3 or 4 Miles no less than 5 if not 6 licens'd Meeting-houses, yet I believe there are not above 10 or 12 Families, or thereabouts belonging to them all. And is not the Intent and Design of these Houses for outward Teaching? Yet these are the men *forsooth* that are all taught by the Spirit! Nay, if there happen to come among them any of those

those little strolling Fellows, whom they call their *Travelling Friends*, what a mighty noise is presently raised in the Neighbourhood? What a deal of bustle and roving from Meeting to Meeting to hear these *Quaker* Prophets? As if the *Light within*, (though believed by them to be sufficient of it self) was not able to teach them any thing without the help of their speakers. Though I am apt to believe if these Men were forbidden their darling Topicks of railing against the *Priests* and the established Religion; their pretended Inspirations would presently be turned into a silent Meeting. If the *Quakers* should object, that we of the Church of *England* preach up the *Light within*, and yet practise and approve of outward Teaching, and consequently that this is as inconsistent in us as in them: you may answer, that though we do with all thankfulness acknowledge the influence of God's Holy Spirit upon our Minds; yet we never are such *Deists* as to affirm, that this is sufficient to Salvation without something else. No! We preach up the Necessity of Faith in a Crucified Jesus! And never set up this *Light within* above the Holy Scriptures; nor do we fancy our selves to be above the Sacred Ordinances and Solemn Institutions of our Blessed Redeemer: but make use of these outward Means and humbly thank God for them; as also for the happy opportunity of reading, hearing and meditating on his revealed Will contained in the Holy Scriptures. And that by relying on the Merits of Christ, who outwardly shed his most Precious Blood for our sakes, and by conforming our selves to the Obedience of his Laws, we may with the Assistance of God's Grace in the due use of these outward Means obtain Everlasting Salvation. But the *Quakers* have debarred themselves from receiving any benefit or advantage by the use of any outward Means whatsoever; for what good can these do them, when the *Light within* is sufficient of it self? Every

ry thing else must needs be insignificant and unnecessary. And therefore their constant Practice of outward teaching is altogether inconsistent with their notions of the *Light within* being sufficient to Salvation without any thing else.

S E C T. VI.

*The Quakers pretences to infallibility
no proof of their being infallible.*

I shall now consider as I proposed some of the mischievous consequences, drawn from this pernicious Doctrine of the *Quakers* about the *Light within*, which involve them in such very great and dangerous errors. And first I shall begin with their pretences to infallibility; for having once got it into their Heads, by I know not what fatal delusion, that the very Person of Christ is within them, nothing would Satisfie them as a consequence from this, but that they needs must be Infallible; And if the *Friends* could but as easily prove their infallibility, as they have with great confidence asserted it, they would be very great Men indeed. For this signifies nothing less, than to have an extraordinary Assistance of God's Spirit, whereby those who are thus assisted are secured from error. Now any man that has but a good assurance may pretend to this if he please; but the main business is to give some reasonable Satisfaction to the World, (as the Apostles did) of such an extraordinary assistance, but this the *Quakers* cannot do. They say indeed over and over that they are infallible, but here they stop, for they don't endeavour to prove it. We used to say affirming and proving were two things; but here the *Quakers* make them the same; for their bare saying they are in-

infallible, is the only proof they have yet given us their being so, and is no more than what we usually call a Womans reason, who is sure she is in the right, because she's sure on't: And for ought I can see, if we should bar the *Quakers* being sure on't, they would want a reason for their infallibility.

They insist much on the Holy Spirit being infallible, but they have never yet been able to give any satisfactory account to the World, that they were infallibly guided by it; and unless it follows, that the *Quakers* are infallible because God's Holy Spirit is so, all their talk about the Spirits infallibility is wholly besides the business.

SECT. VII.

Their vain Conceits of a Sinless Perfection disproved out of their own Writings; Confession of Sin proved a great Duty both from express Texts, and the Examples of the best Men recorded in the Holy Scriptures: the Quakers make no publick Confession of their Sins proved from Authentick Testimonies. G. Whitehead's Evasions about this examined and confuted; A challenge to the Quakers to make it appear that they ever confessed their Sins in publick, or prayed for the Remission of them, never yet taken any notice of.

Another mighty Privilege the *Quakers* lay claim to by having the *Light within*, is a sinless Perfection.

fection : for they have always been desirous to make Ignorant People believe that they could live without Sin. I confess, I have oft wondered what surpassing Excellencies these Men could see in themselves to exert them so much above their Neighbours. We shall easily grant, that they do indeed abstain from some of the inoffensive pleasures, and innocent diversions, which the Worlds People never Scruple to enjoy ; but surely their being afraid of doing what God hath nowhere forbidden, can never be any proof of their being in a state of Perfection. Well but let us go farther, and suppose for once, that the *Friends* (however some of them at least) are not guilty of many of those vices, that are (God knows) but too Common in the World ; what then ? Because they do not drink nor swear, ought they presently to cry up one another for Saints, and the elect People of God ? Why ? Will no Sins damn us, but profaneness, intemperance, and such gross Immoralities ? It must be acknowledged these are Crimes bad enough ; but what do the *Friends* think of wilful Ignorance, Error, Schism, Unbelief, Covetousness, Uncharitableness, Spiritual Pride, *i. e.* a wonderful Opinion of our selves, and a Contempt of others ; railing at or reviling all who oppose us, &c. Are not these great and heinous Offences ? And have the *Quakers* such a mighty Conceit of themselves as to think no Sins of any kind can be laid to their charge ? I do not intend here to rip open their vices, nor enter into the *Detail* of their Disorders ; but shall rather chule from the Words of their Leaders to let you see that the *Quakers* notwithstanding their smooth pretences and seemingly fair out-sides fall very short of a sinless Perfection. George Whitehead in his *Christian Epistle*, to *Friends An. 1689.* tells the *Quakers*, that *very few of them have their Minds Exercised in frequent Prayer, or in Heavenly Meditation, &c.* But too many have their Hearts taken up with these

fading Objects, and things below, minding Earthly things, &c. And p. 10. he charges the Quakers with degenerating into Pride and Height of Spirit and Apparel, as too too many do (says he of the Friends) contrary to gravity, modesty, sobriety, plainness, simplicity, innocency and humility, &c. Who could have thought, that the Serious and Heavenly minded Quakers should let their Hearts on these fading Objects, and take any notice of these Earthly things? Nay and that they should be so vain as to run into pride of apparel! surely George had forgot himself and was describing the world's People, instead of the poor and despised People of the Lord called Quakers. That ever these humble and meek Souls should be accused of exalting themselves in a self-will, self-conceit and affection to Preheminence in Judgment over others, &c. If any of the Quaker Adversaries had given but such a hint of some of their virtues, the Friends would have presently cryed out of lyes and calumnies raised on purpose to slander Truth and its Friends; but I hope G. Whitehead cannot well be suspected of any such design. And long before this G. Fox in his Friends Fellowship, &c. was reprimanding the Quakers for their disorderly and irregular lives in several instances, Number 9 See Mr. for their Men hunting after Women, from Woman Keith's to Woman; and their Womens affections runing sometimes after one Man, and soon after another, and so hold one another in affection, and so draw out the affection of one another; and after a while leave one another, and go one from another, do the same thing; these doings (says he) make mere like Sodom than Saints: And yet theie were the sinless Quakers that were thus guilty. And after he had warned them to take notice of their Backbiters and slanderers, tale carriers and railers, whose work is to sow Dissention, he tells, Number 12, of such of the Quakers as use to go up and down to cheat by borrowing, and getting of Money of Friends in By places, and have cheated several; all such

p. 4.

4th Narrative p. 11.

are to be stopped and judged; as there is a Woman tall in her Person, freckled in her Face; and all one John Harding, who are for Judgment and to be condemned. Here's a sad account of the Quakers failings; and though they publish their faults to the World, yet they are so strangely conceited of their own Holiness, that they never make publick confession of their sins before God, nor ever ask Pardon for Christ Jesus his sake. This plainly demonstrates the Excess of their Spiritual Pride; and that they are in a very sad and deplorable Condition; for without Repentance our Sins will never be pardoned, and how can we repent without confessing our faults? We are told for our encouragement Prov. 28. 13. that *he that confesseth his Sin and forsaketh his Sin shall have Mercy.* But if we scorn to confess them, how do we forsake them, or how can we ever hope to have mercy? For without Confession, there can be no Repentance, and without Repentance there can be no forgiveness of sins. All Mankind has ever been so sensible of the Reasonableness and Necessity of this great Duty, that there are no Men in the World that have any sense of God and Religion but confess and bewail their own unworthiness before God, and implore his mercy for the Remission of their Sins. Unless we except our perfect and sinless Quakers, and these are so Pure and Holy, (if you'll believe them) that they need no Repentance, and therefore never make (as I told you) any Publick Confession of their Sins. They are arrived to such a state of perfection that the best Men upon Earth could never pretend to. Holy Job though he be recorded to be a perfect and upright Man, and one that feared God and eschewed evil, yet he said, *I abhor my Sin and repent in Dust and Ashes.* God by his Prophet Ezekiel has told us that Daniel is one of those three who was the most perfect of all upon Earth; yet if you will read his 9th Chapter you will find him confessing his Sin before God, *And I pray*

Job 1. 1.

Job 42. 6.

Ezek. 14.

14. 20.

just

unto the Lord my God, and made my confession, and said, O Lord, the great and dreadful God, keeping Covenant and mercy to them that love him, and to them that keep his Commandments. We have sinned, and committed Iniquity, and have done wickedly and have Rebelled, even by departing from thy precepts and from thy judgments. While I was Confessing my sin and the sin of my People. But whoever heard of a Quaker Confessing his sins, or saying he abhorred himself and repented in Dust and Ashes? No, No, it's below them to repent by Confessing themselves to be sinners. What, Would you have them to repent, who are *Mee-ker* than Moses, *stronger* than Samson, *wiser* than Solomon, and *more Patient* than Job? They know better things, for they are as Harmless and Innocent as Christ! This *William Shewen* has said of the Quakers in his *Treatise concerning Thoughts and Imaginations*, Printed, 1685 p. 25. and he was a great Writer and Preacher among them. No wonder then that these Quakers who are such extraordinary persons, should say to the Church of England in such a scornful manner, *Alas poor Souls!* are you not at *have mercy upon us*, *Miserable Sinners*, *there is no health in us*, from *seven to seventy*? Thus they laugh at us for Confessing our selves to be sinners! But, *Whitehead* in his *Truth and Innocency*, p. 15. says *alas poor sinners!* *Is not a sign of Laughter at them, but rather of Lamentation and Pity over their miserable estate, who are always confessing, but not forsaking their Sins.* Behold the Damnable Pride and Uncharitableness of these Quakers! What Spirit has seized this *Whitehead*, that he durst pass such an Unchristian censure, not only on the Church of England, but on all the Christian world; to affirm that we are always confessing yet never forsaking our Sins? Why the very Confession of our Sins is one good step towards having them pardoned. *S. John* says if we Confess our Sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our Sins, and to cleanse us from

Dan. 9. 4.

v. 5.

v. 20.

Penn's
Truth Ex-
alted Re-
printed
1671. p.
8, 9.

1 John 1. 9

all Unrighteousness. This proves Confession to be Necessary in order to have our Sins forgiven; But it like the *Quakers*, we are once arrived to that height of Pride and Folly to think, we need make no Confession of our Sins, because we can live without committing any; *S. John* plainly tells us in the Verse foregoing, that we are under a lamentable mistake; *for if we say, that We have no sin,* he assures us *we deceive our selves, and the Truth is not in us.* These words did once so confound a *Quaker*, whom I believe you all know, that when they were urged by a very honest Person to shew their vanity of a sinless perfection, he was moved by his Spirit to tell him, *that he had been with the Devil!* Thus the Enemy of Mankind gnashes his teeth against those who would destroy his Kingdom, for he never can reign so securely in the Souls of poor sinful mortals, as when he can persuade them they have no Sin. And therefore our Blessed Saviour, to prevent our Eternal Ruine, has taught us to Pray daily *forgive us our Sins.* And this does plainly imply that we are sinners, since we are commanded every day to ask forgiveness; And if ever we hope to have our sins forgiven, sure we will not scorn to confess our selves sinners. *For who can say I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my Sin? For there is not a just Man upon Earth, that doth good and Sinneth not??* But why need we heap Quotations to prove that we are sinners? surely a man must be either very senseless and stupified under his Sins, or else must have a very Pharisaical conceit of his own holiness, if he does not by Experience find, that he comes far short of a Spoteless Innocence. Nay there are so many allays of Frailty and Infirmary in the actions even of the best Men in the World; such a mixture of Defects and Imperfections in all our Services, that we must acknowledge after all we can do, we are *unprofitable Servants*; *for in many things we offend all.* Do but consider the *Pharisee* and the

v. 8.

Luke 11.

4.

Prov. 20.

9.

Eccles. 7.

20.

Luke 17.

10.

James 3.

8.

the

the Publican in their Devotions, and you will easily perceive whose carriage and behaviour is the more acceptable with God: The one he prides and plumes himself in his own Righteousness, and makes no Confession of his Sins, as thinking he needed no Repentance, but stood upon his own Justification, and with a brazened Impudence out-faces Heaven, with a *God I thank thee,* Luke 18. *that I am not as other Men are,* &c. 11.

The other the poor Publican, he was so abashed and confounded at the sense of his Sins, and his own unworthiness, that he *would not lift up so much as his Eyes to Heaven,* but stood at a great distance, bewailing and lamenting his folly, and *smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner.* And what was the effect of this shame and Sorrow and confession of Sins: why our Saviour tells us, *That this man went down rather justified than the other.* This needs no application; let the Friends but remember these words of our Saviour, and then desire them to give you a good reason (if they can) why they reproach you, as I know they have done, for Confessing your selves to be sinners? I grant indeed that Confession of Sin may be made, and I am afraid is too often, without forsaking it; yet certainly no man can ever Repent of his Sins, that does not confess himself to have been an Offender. And therefore I shall now prove what I told you, that the Quakers do never make publick Confession of their Sins to God, nor ever ask pardon for the remission of them. It may seem a little hard to oblige my self to prove a Negative; yet I think I can give you such reasonable satisfaction about this, that the Quakers can never be able to contradict. Now to know whether they make confession of their Sins to God in their publick meetings, the only way to be thoroughly informed as to this point, is to inquire of those, who have been long of their society and constant hearers of them; and then examine what the Quakers can say for themselves, whether they

See Picture of
Quakers
rise, p.
64.
The Quakers
set in
their true
light. p.
18. &c.

do ever make any such publick Confessions of their Sins or not. As to the first I shall only produce two Witneses, one shall be Mr. Bugg; I know the Friends are ready to rise up almost in Indignation at the very name of such a Formidable Man as Francis Bugg; And truly I think for no other reason, but for telling them the Truth. However there can be no just Objection against his being in this case a very credible and competent Witness. For he has told the World in several of his Books which he has wrote against the Quakers, that he has been in their society above five and twenty years; and yet in all that time he never heard the Quakers in their publick Prayers in Meetings make any Confession of Sins to God, or beg Pardon for Christ's sake; nay he tell us further that he has read over a great Number of their Books, which he particularly names containing some Thousands of pages, and yet he says he could not find one passage in all those Books where this necessary Christian Duty of Confession of Sin, or begging Pardon for Christ his sake, is ever so much as mentioned; and desires the Quakers to read as he has done, and then disprove him if they can. My other Witness is Daniel Leeds before mentioned, who in his *News of a Trumpet Sounding in the Wilderness*, &c. p. 138. 139. charges, the Quakers in these Words: *You never in your Meetings pray for Pardon or Forgiveness of Sin (not that I have heard in Twenty years due Attendance) for seeing it is Christ in you that Prays, there is no need of it, he being without sin. Secondly, you do not Pray to Christ, because it being Christ in you, that prays, it is absurd for Christ to pray to himself.* Here you have as an Authentick account as can well be desired of the Quaker-Practices both at home and abroad; that they never make any Confession of their Sins; nor ever pray in their Meetings for Pardon and Forgiveness of them. Now this being a matter of great Consequence, you must know the Friends have

have been frequently told of this Omission; which most certainly is a very daring Arrogance, and the sad Effect of a strange *Pharisaical Pride*. And therefore in the 2d place I shall show you, what poor and guilty excuses the *Quakers* are forced to make, to clear themselves of this Accusation. *G. Whitehead* in his *Sober Expostulation*, p. 42. has the confidence to tell the World, that *Buggs* charging the *Quakers* with *making no Confession of Sin to God in Prayer, nor begging Pardon for the same, are two notorious Falshoods*; And you shall hear how notably he confutes him; *knowing* (says *Whitehead*) *that many who frequent our Meetings, have great need of both Sincere Confession, Repentance and Pardon of Sin*. But is this any proof that *Mr. Bugg* charged the *Quakers* falsely, because many who frequent their Meetings have need of Repentance? No Surely! This is only playing at cross purposes; and *George* is here amusing his Reader with an impertinent answer. He does not say the *Quakers* in general have any need of Confession and Repentance; and that therefore they do actually confess their Sins and ask God Pardon for them: No, No, have a care of that, for this is as much as to say they are all sinners, which must by no means be allowed of. Only *many have need of Repentance who frequent their meetings*! But who are those *many* who have such need of Repentance? I shrewdly suspect *Whitehead* does not mean any of the *Quakers*; for he knows full well there a great many Giddy headed and unstable People, who oft run to meetings, who are no *Quakers*: And these I suppose are the persons whom he thinks need Repentance and Pardon of Sin. Now if this be his meaning, he lets us see the *Quaker plainness* and sincerity. If by *many* he means many of the *Quakers*, we are very much of his mind, that not many only, but all of them ought to *confess their Sins, and need also Repentance and Pardon of Sin, for Christs sake, and their own poor Souls*. And therefore we charge it

p.

upon them as a very great crime to omit this so exprels, so reasonable and so necessary a Duty. Now how do the *Quakers* clear themselves of this? Why you see, only by dodging and trifling; for *G. Whitehead* does not say one word more to the matter than what I have quoted: Which I am sure is very far from proving Mr. *Bugg* guilty of charging the *Friends* with *two notorious falsehoods*; nay I am confident that this same *Whitehead* knows in his own conscience that Mr. *Bugg* has here affirmed two very great Truths; which neither he nor any of the *Friends* with all their little evasions can ever be able to disprove. And I think I can make this very plain to you: For the Author of the *Snake* made his publick challenge, If any (says he) can give Evidence, that ever he heard, at any *Quaker* meeting, Remission of Sins prayed for, he is desired for the Vindication of the Truth, to declare it. Now this must be allowed to be a very home charge, and it might be expected that the *Quakers* would endeavour to acquit themselves of such a notorious instance of their spiritual Pride. And yet I do assure you, *Whitehead* himself, though he wrote a pretended Answer to this very Book, which he calls an *Antidote* &c. above mentioned, takes no notice of this, but passes it over without so much as once naming it. *Wyeth* in his *Switch*, he also slips this over; though the *Quakers* are told in the very same page, that several of them have been guilty of wronging and defrauding their Neighbours, and therefore have certainly sinned against God; And that if any of the *Friends* had a mind to be satisfied as to this, undeniable instances were offered to be produced. But thank you for that, the *Quakers* were deaf on that ear: And *Wyeth* was wiser than to acquaint his *Sober Reader* with any such filthy business as this; no, no he was too conscious of guilt, and had no mind their knaveries should be exposed to the World. And yet these are the men, truly, that can wipe their Mouths, and brazen it out as if they needed no *Repentance*; Let any

st. Edit.

313.

ake,

to 2.

dit p.

31.

any man therefore judge of the modesty of these Quakers, who can cry out of *falsehoods*, notorious *falsehoods*, when they are told that they *never confess their Sins to God in Prayer, nor beg Pardon for the same in their meetings*: And yet you see they have not one word to offer, nor one syllable to say in their own Vindication. And how these men can ever expect to have their *Sins forgiven*, when they out of a proud conceit of their own *Righteousness*, never pray in their meetings for *Remission of their Sins*. I leave it to the serious consideration of their sober minded and well disposed Hearers.

S E C T. VIII.

The Quakers deny Jesus Christ to be the Son of God.

THIS is another fatal Error, that seems to follow from the Quaker-Principle of the *Light within*; for *Mr. Penn* in his serious Apology, &c. has boldly declared (as is well known) in the name of all the Quakers, That though they do acknowledge Christ suffered his Body to be Crucified by the Jews without the Gates at *Jerusalem*; yet says he, *that the outward Person which suffered was properly the Son of God, we utterly deny*. Here's a rare Confession of the Quakers Christianity! This is in plain terms a *Damnable heresie*, and a *denying the Lord that bought them*. For nothing can be more expressly contrary to the Scriptures, than to say, *Jesus Christ that suffered was not properly the Son of God*. When our blessed Saviour asked his Disciples, what the World thought of him, and whom they supposed him to be; *Mat. 16. 13. Simon Peter answered and said verſe. 16. Thou art Christ the Son*

p. 146.

Mark i. 1.

Rom. 1. 4.

Matt. 27.

54.

Matt. 14.

33.

Luke 1.

32, &c.

Switch,

p. 201.

Son of the living God. And John 6. 69. *We believe and are sure, that thou art Christ, the Son of the living God; and S. John tells us, 20. 31. These are written that ye might believe, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.* Nay hold, say the Quakers, the outward Person that suffered to have been properly the Son of God we utterly deny. I know they have struggled hard to rid themselves of this most scandalous Doctrine, but all in vain: And they would come off by telling us, That, *W. Penn's meaning, was no other than that the outward Person, that Body which our Lord did take of the Virgin, was not properly the Son of God by eternal Generation.* What's the meaning of this? Why did ever any Man in his wits either affirm or believe, that the Body which our Lord did take of the Virgin was properly the Son of God by eternal Generation? No! No Man in the world ever said so; therefore Mr. Penn is by this senseless notion no ways justified but rather exposed, and the Quaker Principle laid more open. For the dispute between *W. Penn* and his Opponents, was not about the eternal Generation of the Body of Christ which was born of the Virgin, as if they had been so absurd to suppose it to have existed from all Eternity; But the true state of the Controversie was, whether Jesus of Nazareth who outwardly suffered Death without the Gates of Jerusalem, did so assume our flesh into an hypostatical or personal Union with his Divine Nature, so as properly to be the Son of God? And this you see Mr. Penn in the name of the Quakers utterly denies. Which said and say again is a *Damnable Heresie*, and *denying the Lord that bought them.* For He that suffered was truly and properly the Son of God according to his Generation in the fulness of time as he was also the Son of God by eternal Generation before all ages. And whoever denies this, renounces the main Object of the Christian Faith, *Manifested in the flesh!* And this the Quakers will by no means believe, that Christ took our Nature in

1 Tim.

3. 16.

into his Person so as to be both God and *Man*. For though they say Christ is God, yet they *will* not own him to be truly and *properly* a Man; they acknowledge Jesus also to have been a Man, but not God; i. e. he was not personally united to the God-head. For we can never call (say they) *the Bodily Garment Christ*. They say indeed that Christ dwelt in the Body of Jesus; yet according to their wild conceits they do not allow that he did Consist of it, so as to be any part of his Nature. Hear *G. Whitehead*, I distinguish (said he) *between consisting and having: Christ had visible Flesh and Bones, but he did not consist of them*. Here's the Heart of the Quaker Heresie; They'll readily confess that Christ had whilst on Earth a Body of Flesh and Blood. But how? Why truly only as a veil or a Garment; this is plainly their meaning as you see by *G. Whitehead's* words; for he had a Body of Flesh and Blood, but according to them could throw it off at leisure; assuming it only as an Angel assumes a Body, for he did not *consist* of it. Therefore the Visible Body or Manhood, (or as *Mr. Penn* words it, *the outward Person*) that was born of the Virgin and suffered at *Jerusalem* could be no part of the true Christ or Son of God; and no wonder then that *Mr. Penn* has denied Jesus of *Nazareth* to be *properly* the Son of God; for *Christopher Arkinson* in his word of the Lord drawn, has in plain terms told us long before, that to affirm Christ to be God and Man in one Person, is a lye. Now if any of you have a mind to be better satisfied concerning this abominable Heresie of the *Quakers*, you may ask the *Friends* whom they do suppose to be the immediate Father of Jesus of *Nazareth*, who suffered at *Jerusalem*? It to evade this, they will only answer you in general Terms, by saying, that neither they nor their Friend *Penn* ever denied him to be the Son of God; tell them this is only a shuffle, and no answer to your Question; but desire them in short

Some Principles &c. p. 126
a Question fors, p. 33
Christian Quaker, p. 139.

p. 5.

to

to give you a positive answer, Whether according to their Scheme of Divinity they do believe God Almighty to be his immediate Father or not? If he be; then ask a reason, Why Mr. Penn, in the name of the *Quakers*, has utterly denyed him to be properly his Son? Till the *Friends* will give us a plain answer to this, let the charge stand good against them, that they deny *Jesus of Nazareth* to be properly the Son of God.

C H A P. III.

Of the Holy Sacraments.

S E C T. I.

The Quakers as a plain consequence from the foregoing Doctrine, deny the sacred Institutions of our Saviour; viz. outward or Water Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. Water Baptism prov'd to be expressly commanded by Jesus Christ; Practised by his Apostles, and the Christian Church in all Ages ever since their time. Some of the Quaker objections against this Institution briefly answered.

THAT the *Quakers* have in fact renounced the Solemn Institutions of *Jesus Christ*, viz. outward or Water Baptism and the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is so well known to you, that I shall not now stay to prove it; And their slighting and disregarding these sacred Ordinances, seem plainly to follow from their Anti-Christian Notions of the *Light within*: For this being (as they dream,) the very Christ of God that is within them, they think to believe in this is sufficient to Salvation without any thing else; and therefore they deny

deny that there is any necessity to have Faith in an outward Jesus, and consequently they will not be baptized in his name; nor do they think it worth their while Solemnly to Remember, what he has done and suffered for them; for you see they will not allow him to be properly the son of God; nor the outward Blood, which was shed at *Jerusalem*, to be the meritorious cause of their Salvation.

This is the right Quaker-Heresie, and the true reason, why the *Quakers* reject the Holy Sacraments, those sacred Mysteries of our Religion, (by which we are dedicated to Christ, and shew forth his Death and sufferings) as *carnal Rites* and *beggarly Elements*. However since the *Friends* the better to hide their great Infidelity, pretend that these Ordinances cannot be proved to be now in force; I shall endeavour to lay open the lamentable mistakes of our Enthusiasts, by making it plainly appear, that they were instituted and enjoined by our Saviour, and are of perpetual Obligation.

In order therefore to set these matters in their true light, I shall in the first place prove, that Water Baptism is expressly commanded by our Saviour: And this is so notoriously evident, that no Man of reason can deny it, if he will but acknowledge the Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures. For we read in the 28. of *S. Matthew*, that after our Blessed Lord had informed his Disciples, that *all Power was given unto him in Heaven and in Earth*; he then gave to them a Solemn Commission, *to go Preach and make Disciples to him in all Nations*, (for that is the strict signification of the word) *Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*. This is the Fundamental Charter of Christian Baptism; and whoever embraces the Christian Religion, must be admitted into the Church by this Federal Rite of outward or Water Baptism; for by this we are made Members of the Body of Christ, and are united to the Society of Christians.

v. 18.

v. 19.

But

But we are told that *it's begging the Question to say, to say that our Saviour in the words above quoted p. 262. does command his Disciples to Baptize with Water.*

But how can this be begging the Question when they have been answered a Thousand times, that the strict and natural signification of the Greek word *Baptize* which we still retain in our Translation is properly to wash or sprinkle with Water?

And have they ever made it appear, that it was either an absurdity or a Contradiction, for our Saviour to give Authority to his Disciples, to initiate men by this Solemn Rite into the Christian Religion? No! this was impossible to be done. For this was a Religious Ceremony made use of both by Jews and Gentiles and therefore some think our Saviour seems to have chosen it for that very reason. "For seeing it was a com-

"mon Rite of all Religions, as a very great

"Man has observ'd, and in it self very signifi-

"cant of that Purity which is the great design

"of all Religion, it was the more likely to find

"the easier Acceptance, and to be most suitable

"to that which our Saviour intended to be the U-

"niversal Religion of the World. And to put

this matter beyond all dispute we have sufficient

evidence, that the Apostles themselves did actu-

ally Baptize with *Water*, those whom they con-

verted to the Christian faith; and I hope the *Qua-*

kers will allow them to understand the meaning

and design of our Saviours Commission. Did not

Philip go down with the Eunuch into the Water,

and Baptize him? Was not *S. Paul* though con-

verted after an Extraordinary manner command-

ed to be *Baptized and wash away his Sins?* Don't

we read, that *when S. Peter saw the Holy Ghost*

visibly descend upon *Carnelius* and his Friends, he

upon that immediately Baptized them; and

said, *can any man forbid, or Deny Water, that*

these should not be baptized, which have receiv-

ed the Holy Ghost as well as we? Now these re-

mark-

Acts 8.

36. 38.

Acts 22.

16.

Acts 10.

47.

markable instances (to name no more) of this Apostolical practice are a plain demonstration that as the Apostles were invested by our Saviour after his Resurrection with full Power and Authority to teach a new Religion to Mankind; so they did most certainly understand that by vertue of the same commission, they were to be entered into it, not by a bare verbal Profession, but by this known and Solemn Rite of Baptizing with Water. And agreeable to the Apostles Practice founded on our Saviours positive and express command, the Christian Church has in all ages and in all climates, and in all Countries Universally *Baptized* with Water, and will no doubt thus initiate Profelytes *always even unto the end of the World*. These things carry their own Light with them, and it must needs be great *Obstinacy* not to yield to such rational and well grounded arguments; for there can be no better *mediums* made use of to prove any Articles of the Christian faith, than these by which Water Baptism is proved to be of Divine Institution; and whoever thinks these reasons not convincing, can give no reason for being a Christian. Now what say the *Quakers* to this? why they affirm with great confidence, that the Baptism commanded *Math.* 28. 19. was not Water Baptism, but only the inward and Spiritual Baptism with the Holy Ghost. But how do they prove this? *J. Wyeth*, discoursing about these words of our Saviour, tells us that *the Question is concerning something said to be required in the Commission which the Commission does not express; therefore say we, (i.e. the Quakers) not contained in it.* But the *Quakers* by this way of arguing are so far from running down Water Baptism that they make our Saviours command to his Disciples to signifie just nothing at all; for every body that can but read, must acknowledge, that Baptism with the Spirit is not expressed in the Commission, therefore according to their Logick not contained in it. Thus they ridicule our Saviours

Autho-

Authority rather than confess themselves to be in an Error! But how come the *Quakers* to imagine, that the Apostles had Power to Baptize with the Holy Ghost? You may assure yourselves, the Holy Scriptures say not one Syllable to this purpose, for where ever we read there, of Baptizing with the Spirit, it's always applyed to Christ, and never to men. For to Baptize with the Holy Ghost, is to give the Holy Ghost, and can poor mortals do this? No! The *Quakers* have been told over and over that this is the Gift of Christ only; and that it's Blasphemy to assert the contrary. Now all the answer that they return is in short only this, That *though it be true*, Switch, *that the Holy Ghost is originally Christs Gift, yet men* p. 262. *fittly prepared have instrumentally given the Gifts of the Holy Spirit.* But how instrumentally? why Rom. 1 they instance in *S. Paul* that he had a desire to *impart some Spiritual Gift.* Well, what then? did he therefore pretend to Baptize with the Spirit? A strange Consequence! What! no difference between the mission or sending the Holy Ghost, and the Spiritual Gifts of Faith, Conversion, &c. which are only the works and effects of the Spirit? It's a great sign the *Quakers* are altogether unacquainted with *Spiritual Gifts*, if they are resolved not to distinguish these things which do so wonderfully differ. And therefore to conclude this point, desire them either to produce some plain proofs out of the Holy Scriptures, which they have never yet pretended to, that our Saviour gave Commission to his Apostles to Baptize with the Holy Ghost. Or else tell them, it's only a Dream and Fiction invented to support and maintain a weak and desperate cause. Here you see the Foundation of Water Baptism; which I have shewed you, is built on a plain and expresse Command of our Saviour, the Examples of the Apostles, and the constant practice of the Catholick Church. And all that the *Quakers* have to say for their neglecting and despising this

Institution, is only to raise some little exceptions, and to propose some seeming difficulties which men of cavilling tempers may object against the plainest Truths in the World. I shall not now stay to examine them; the ingenious Author of the *Snake in the Grass* has wrote a very Excellent Discourse of the Divine Institution of Water Baptism; which I know some of you have seen, wherein all the little pretences and Evasions started against it by the *Quakers* are fairly proposed and confuted: and that so very effectually, that they have never yet been able to reply to it; (unless *G. Whitehead's* page or two at the end of his *Antidote* must pass for an Answer.) Therefore if you should ever happen to have any Scruples about the Obligation of this Divine Precept, a Serious perusal of that Book, which I will at any time lend you, I doubt not will give you sufficient Satisfaction. I shall only here then take notice of an Objection or two, which are frequently in the Mouths of the *Quakers* against Baptism, which I find *Mr. Penn* has urged also in his *Key*, p. 24. where he tells us, *it is sufficient to them, i. e. the Quakers, that Water Baptism was John's and not Christ's.* How so? Because John truly Baptized with Water, but ye, i. e. the Apostles, shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. What then? Was this such a bar or hindrance to our Saviour, that he therefore could not Command his Apostles and their Successors to Baptize with Water? Or because the Apostles were to be Baptiz'd with the Holy Ghost, have the *Quakers* any reason therefore to expect the same Privilege? This is strange reasoning: But he goes on and affirms that *Jesus never used it, i. e. Water Baptism*; But did he therefore never Command it? I suppose the King in person never tendered to any the Oath of Allegiance, does it therefore follow, that none are obliged to take it? For the question is not whether our Saviour did himself actually Baptize, but whether or no he gave orders to others to do it in his Name? And this is what the *Quakers* take

no

Acts 1 5.

John 4 2:

no notice of, which is the main thing that ought to be considered. We readily grant, that *Jesus himself Baptized not but his Disciples*, yet it's said in the verse before, that *the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more Disciples than John*; from hence it's very plain, that our Saviours Disciples did Baptize by his authority: which is in effect the same thing, as if he had Baptized himself; therefore Mr. Penn's Objection from *John 4. 2.* is nothing at all to the purpose. I have only given you a taste of the *Quakers* weak way of arguing against Water Baptism, and shall say no more of it here, but refer you to the above-mentioned Discourse. And upon the whole I would not have you imagine, that a mere washing the Skin, or a little sprinkling the Face is all that is required of you in Baptism; he that thinks thus, makes it an empty piece of Pageantry and an insignificant Ceremony; for what will it avail us to have been baptized in the Name of Christ, and thereby to be admitted Members of the Christian Church, if we do not mind to perform the Conditions on our parts, unto which we are obliged by our Baptismal Covenant? *To be baptized into Christ* is to *put on Christ*; by which is not only meant to make an outward or publick Profession of Christianity, but that by baptism we enter also into Covenant with him; for if we only regard the outward Baptism which is the sign or seal of the Covenant, and take no notice of the thing signified, which is inward and Spiritual, we utterly exclude our selves from receiving any benefit or advantage by our Christian Baptism; for though as *S. Paul* tells us *God saves us according to his Mercy by the washing of regeneration*, by which is plainly meant Baptism, so we are also *saved by the renewing of the Holy Ghost*. On the other Hand if the *Quakers* will needs believe themselves to be so spiritually raised above all sensible things, so as to slight and undervalue being admitted Members of the Christian

John 4. 2.
v. 1.

Gal. 3.
27.

Tit. 3. 5.

Church by the Federal Rite of Water-Baptism, they are in very great danger of losing all the Blessings of the Gospel. For we must not make a fanciful application of God's gracious Mercies and promises to our selves, but with all thankfulness receive them as our Lord and Saviour is pleased to bestow them; And he has in plain terms told us; except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. And that he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Therefore any Man that values his Soul ought to be very careful not to neglect or renounce this positive Institution, which our Saviour has expressly appointed and commanded in order to our eternal Salvation.

John 3. 5.
Mark 16.
16.

S E C T. II.

The Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper plainly shewn also to be of Divine Institution; And proved from its end and design, and from the account S. Paul gives us of it, to be of perpetual obligation. What the Quakers can say against it, briefly answered.

HAVING now proved, that Water or outward Baptism is by virtue of a Divine Command the Seal of the Covenant, and the Solemn Rite of Admission into the Christian Church; shall in the second place make it evident that the Lord's Supper is also a sacred Ordinance, by which we renew our Baptismal Vow and Commemorate the Death and Sufferings of our Blessed Redeemer.

For this was ordained and expressly commanded by our dearest Lord; who the same night that

1 Cor. 11.
24, 25.

he was betrayed took Bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my Body which is broken for you; this do in Remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the Cup, when he had supped, saying, This Cup is the New testament in my Blood: This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in Remembrance of me. Now if you will but compare what the Apostle says here concerning this institution, which he tells us expressly, he received from the Lord, with that account which the Evangelists have given us of this holy mystery, you cannot but stand amazed at the monstrous unreasonableness of the Quakers to deny the Celebration of the Lord's Supper to be a Command of our Saviour.

v 23.

That Jesus Christ had Power and Authority to constitute and ordain what outward means He in his Infinite Wisdom thought most proper to convey to our Souls the Efficacy and Benefits of his Death and sufferings, is so certain a truth, that I know the Quakers dare not but acknowledge it; That he actually did appoint the Sacramental eating and drinking of his Body and Blood for sacred ends and solemn purposes, is as plain as can be expressed in words. For S. Matthew assures us, *Matt. 26* that Jesus took Bread and Blessed it, and Brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, and said, Take, eat; *26, 27, 28.* this is my Body. And He took the Cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it: For this is my Blood of the new Testament which is shed for many, for the Remission of Sins. Much to the same purpose is that account which S. Mark *Mark 14* gives of this matter; S. Luke also with little variation, gives the same account, only he says with *Luk. 22* S. Paul, that our Saviour added these words in *19.* the Institution of this Sacrament, viz. *This do in remembrance of me.* Here we have as formal a Command as I told you could well be contrived in words; And if the Quakers are resolved to repeal this Law, they may with as much reason renounce any Law in the Bible; for it's only

ly urging the same argument, which Mr. Penn has made use of to annul both Water Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the business is done; for he tells us in his book called *reason against railing*, p 109. concerning these Institutions, that they, i. e. *Quakers*, can testify from the same Spirit, by which Paul renounced Circumcision; that they are to be rejected, as not now required. Now can any Man of sense think W. Penn was in earnest, when he wrote after this wild and extravagant manner? For does he think his *ipse dixit* is enough to Countermand our Saviours Authority, and reverse the Laws of his Religion? What! has William Penn the Quaker obtained so mighty a Privilege? Let him then or any of the *Quakers* come forth, and produce their Credentials as S. Paul did; i. e. let them work Miracles, and then they'll have something to say for themselves. They do indeed make high pretences to the Spirit, and upon this account daringly presume to reject Divine Commands: But have they ever given us any reason to believe, that they have received any such commission for doing so? Now unless they are able to Satisfie us of the truth of these pretensions; we ought to conclude, that they are a company of deluded People, who mistake fancy for reason, and their own brain sick dreams, for Heavenly Inspirations.

If the *Quakers* are guided by the same Spirit with S. Paul, they would do well to inform us, why that great Apostle gave such particular orders and Instructions to the *Corinthians* as we find at large in his first Epistle to them, 11. chap. from the 20. verse to the end of that Chapter, (which I desire you seriously to read over) how they should fit and prepare themselves in order to a due and worthy receiving of the Lord's Supper if he had not thought it to have been a necessary Duty for them to be partakers of it? If this was only an useless Rite, as the *Quakers* would needs persuade the World, S. Paul would never have com-

commanded the *Corinthians* to Communicate, when he knew they were guilty of such great disorders and indecent practices at the Lord's Table, that they were afflicted with divers diseases, and some of them struck dead for their horrible prophanation of this Blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord. But notwithstanding this, he gave them no encouragement to abstain from it, as if it were indifferent whether they received or not; he had no Authority to do this, but on the contrary he charges them to approach it hereafter with more care and greater reverence, and exhorts them to *examine* themselves, and then to *eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup*; and shews the great reasonableness of this in the next verses; *for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh Damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body; for for this very Cause of unworthy eating, many now are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.* Now from this it is very plain, that the Apostle did suppose the *Corinthians*, and consequently all Christians, under a strict Obligation to Obey this Institution in Remembrance or Commemoration of our Saviour; and that he did not think it ought to be laid aside, though in the Church of *Corinth* remarkable Judgments, as grievous diseases and Death its self, were the fatal consequences of unworthy receiving. For he had received by some extraordinary Revelation an account of this Holy Mystery from our Saviour Christ himself, who declared this to be his last and dying command, and a Solemn part of his Holy Religion; And therefore the Apostle tells the *Corinthians*; that what he delivered unto them, was what he had "received of the Lord, *i. e.* that it was no idle "story, nor vain account of his own invention, but "a true and exact relation of what the Blessed *Jesus* then did, when in the same night in which he was betrayed, he took Bread, and when

he had given thanks, brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my Body which is broken for you, this do in Remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the Cup when he had supped, saying, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it in Remembrance of me. I repeat to you once more these words, because the Quakers would needs have them to be only an account of matter of Fact; and will by no means allow them sufficient to prove the Lord's Supper to be a Divine Institution. Thus says J. Wyeth, *These words of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 11. 23. &c. are plainly a Narration of somewhat done by our Saviour, but contain not any Institution, or Command, as the observing Reader may find.* He must certainly come far short of an observing Reader, if a Quakers bold and confident assertion without proof will pass for a rational argument. For does not the Apostle tell us, that he had it by immediate Revelation from our Lord himself, that he took Bread and brake it, &c. And did he not also charge his Disciples to do this in Remembrance of him? And is not *Do this* a Command? And is not what our Saviour commanded a Divine Institution? Whether our Saviour gave a new Command to S. Paul concerning this Holy Sacrament is not at all material; it's very evident, that he expressly revealed to him, what he had heretofore commanded his Disciples to do in Remembrance of him; which is a Demonstration, that he thought this to be of very great consequence, or else it cannot be supposed, that he would have informed the Apostle of it after such an extraordinary manner. And therefore if the Quakers are resolved to deny what our Saviour has strictly enjoined his Disciples to do in Remembrance of him, to be either an *Institution* or a *Command*; it's a sign they are not to be convinced either by Scripture or Reason. But to you, who I hope will be guided by both, I think what I have said is enough

to prove the Lord's *Supper* to be of Divine Institution. And no man can imagine that it was intended only for a temporary sort of a Law, which was in a short time to expire of it self; for *S. Paul*, whom all Christians must allow sufficient Authority to put this matter out of all dispute, has assured us, that it was to be constantly observed in the Christian Church, as a Solemn Memorial of our Lord's Death and Sufferings; *for as often (says he) as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till he come: 26.* 1 Cor. 11.

That is untill the time of his second coming, which will be at the end of the World. That this is the true meaning of the Apostle is very plain, not only from the reason and end of the Institution it self, but also from the Practice of the Apostles, and the practice of the Church in all succeeding Ages ever since; which must be owned to be the best Interpreters of the Scriptures. But all this signifies nothing to the *Quakers*; for they have got an odd notion of their own, about our Saviours coming, which they fancy will answer all difficulties; and whenever they are told of these words of *S. Paul*, they presently reply that the Apostle only means untill his Spiritual coming in our hearts; and they having got Christ the Substance, they have no need of the outward shadow, and therefore upon this poor pretence have slighted and rejected the Lord's Supper. But no man can possibly be deceived by such sickly conceits and Enthusiastick dreams, unless he's resolved to prefer the Books of *Barclay* and *Penn* before the writings of Christ and his Apostles. For there is not one syllable to this purpose in all the new Testament, that outward Ordinances of Christs own appointment should cease at his Spiritual Appearance in our Hearts. But the *Quakers* say, that *they truly feeling in themselves the very thing, which outward Water, Bread and Wine do signifie, they leave them off.* Why so? Have they any reason or Authority for this? Do not the

Penns
Key, &c.
p. 26.

the *Quakers* imagine, that the Apostles did feel in themselves the very thing as they express it, which Bread and Wine signifie, as *truly* as the best *Quaker* of them all, and did they leave them off, as useless and insignificant? No! They had greater regard to their Master, than to neglect what he had so positively commanded. For both they and the first converts to the Christian faith were partakers of this Sacred Ordinance; as is plain from *Acts* 2. 42. 46. *And they continued stedfastly in the Apostles Doctrine and Fellowship, and in breaking of Bread and in Prayers. And they continued daily with one accord in the Temple and breaking Bread, Acts* 20. 7. *And upon the first Day of the week, when the Disciples came together to break Bread, i. e. to receive the Holy Communion; for you see that breaking of Bread in the first verse quoted is placed amidst other Holy Actions, as Preaching and Prayers, and therefore, as has been well observed, in all reason must be concluded to be it felt of that nature, not a common, but an Holy action. And the same great man assures us, that the Syriack (an ancient Translation) understands breaking of Bread in the other verses, to be receiving the Eucharist or the Lord's Supper; from whence it's very plain by the Apostles Practice, whom the Quakers cannot deny to have had Christ Spiritually come in their Hearts, that they did not think themselves exempted from obeying our Saviours Institutions. And how come our Quakers then to be wiser or holier than the Apostles? I am sure to despise what Christ has bid them do in Remembrance of him, is far from being a sign, either of their goodness or their Wisdom: Nay. this is casting a great contempt on our Saviours Wisdom to pretend they are above his Ordinances, and to think they have no need of such outward things. Blessed God! What Spirit of Pride and Ingratitude then must this be, that dares thus publickly affront and insolently oppose the Wisdom and*

Authori-

Bp. patr. c²

Authority of our Blessed Redeemer? If He who best knows our natures, has been pleased to adapt and accommodate sensible things, to convey to us Spiritual blessings; what strange Impudence must it be in the *Quakers* to quarrel with such Means and Institutions which are fitted and appointed by Christ himself for that end? You see when he had blessed, *broken* and *delivered* the Bread to his *Disciples*, he commanded them to *take, eat and do this* (that they saw him do) in *Remembrance of him*. And when he had Blessed the Cup and given it to them, he commanded them to *drink all of it*; and as often as they drink it to do it, in *Remembrance of him*. Now what do the *Quakers* think was the meaning of all this? Do they imagine our Saviour commanded his *Disciples* to do this for no end, and upon no design? what! When he expressly says *Do this in Remembrance of me*? What is more evident than that one of the great ends of eating Bread and drinking Wine in the holy Communion, is to commemorate the Death and Sufferings of our Lord? and have not we as much reason as the Apostles and Primitive Christians had to call to mind, what the Blessed Jesus did for us? did not he assume our nature, and live a mean and contemptible Life here on Earth, and at last underwent a Cruel and Ignominious Death for our sakes? and ought this ever to be forgotten by Christians? Do not we now, and will not all Christians to the end of the World hope to obtain Pardon of sins, the Assistance of God's Grace, and hereafter a Blessed Immortality? And did not Christ purchase for us by the shedding of his most Precious Blood these inestimable Benefits? Ought we not therefore to be frequently mindful of and thankful for these mercies in all the ways and means prescribed to us for that purpose.

Now the Merits of Christ's Death are most effectually applyed to us by a worthy receiving of the Sacrament; so *S. Paul, The Cup of blessing* 1 Cor. 10. 16.

Sing, says he, which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? i. e. Our receiving the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are the means of conveying those inestimable Blessings to us, which Christians enjoy by the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.

And if the *Quakers* will have nothing to do with these means, I am afraid they will be excluded from enjoying any benefit or advantage by the Death and Sufferings of our Saviour: For they who will not go to Heaven according to the Terms and Conditions of the Gospel, must never expect to get thither through by-ways and paths of their own.

Had the Son of God commanded us to have undertaken some very difficult matter for his sake if we had willfully and obstinately refused it, we could have no reason to call our selves his Disciples: But when he has only bid us eat Bread and drink Wine in a Religious manner, that we might by such a sacred Action call to mind what extraordinary things our Dearest Lord had done and suffered for us; if we will not do this, we seem to quit claim to the very name of Christians and to act rather like *Despisers* than the *Worshippers* of a Crucified Jesus.

Let not therefore any of the Quakerly trifling Objections ever hinder you from being *Worthy Partakers* of this Holy Sacrament; but rather let me desire you to take the *Bible* into your hands, and begging God's blessing upon your endeavours, seriously read and impartially examine those texts of God's revealed will which I have already quoted relating to this Solemn Institution; and I doubt not, but you in your own consciences must be convinced, that *Receiving the Lord's Supper* is a great Duty, and as much now in force, and will be to the end of the World, as any of the ten Commandments.

S E C T. III.

The Quakers have prophanely abused and reviled these Divine Institutions; and have set up others of their own invention, which they call the good Ordinances of Jesus Christ.

NOW the *Quakers* have not only rejected both the Sacraments of Water Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which you see are as positively commanded as any Law in the Whole Bible; but they have branded them with vile and reproachful names, and have set up in their stead some novel inventions of their own, which they have called the good Ordinances of Jesus Christ.

First that they have spoken contemptuously of these Venerable Mysteries of the Christian Religion, I have a Paper by me wrote by G. Fox, wherein he says, that *the World's Baptism is with sprinkling a little Water; and the Cup the World takes is a little Bread and Wine, and that, says he, they call a Sacrament, which there is no Scripture for, and so they (i. e. the Priests) shew forth the Spirit of error.* I could shew you also a long rambling Epistle sent by a *Quaker* to some of the Ancient Friends, in which he's giving them an account of his conversion to *Quakerism* by *George Fox*; and to let us see that he was a very fit Scholar for such a Master, he tells them, that having had troubles upon him some time before, *he thought if he did but receive the Bread and Wine, which the Priests call a Sacrament, he should be well; But when I had taken the read, I thought,* says he, *the Devil ha entered into me, and that I had sinned against the Holy Ghost!* but we need not rantack the *Quaker* manuscripts to make

A Discov-
ery of
the Man
of Sin, p
8. print-
ed, 1654.

p. 11.

Printed,
655.

p. 14.

p. 35.

make good this charge against them, they themselves have published enough to this purpose. *We deny, say the Quakers, your faith, which you say is nourished by Bread and Wine, which is Carnal; and your sprinkling of Infants we deny, which you say you can clear up to be an Ordinance of Christ, but doth not, nor can do it. We deny your Carnal Sacrament, for which there is no scripture. The next year after out comes Fox his News out of the North, and you shall hear how he belched forth his rage and Spite against these means which Christ appointed in order to our Salvation. And their sacrament (says he) as they call it, is Carnal: And their Communion is Carnal, a little Bread and Wine, which is the Table of Devils, and Cup of Devils, which is in the Generation of Serpents in this Great City Sodom and Gomorah, so dust is the Serpents meat, &c. You say that sprinkling Infants is the Baptism which Baptizeth them into the faith, and so into the Church which is Carnal: And you tell People of a Sacrament bringing them to eat a little Bread and Wine, and say, that this is a Communion of Saints, which is Carnal, and all this feeds the Carnal Mind, &c. Edward Burroughs, p. 190. of his Works Printed 1672. says, Their Doctrines are of the Devil, who say sprinkling infants with Water is Baptism into the faith of Christ, this is the Doctrine of the Devil. And p. 191. these have filled the World with Damnable Heresies, as holding forth, that sprinkling infants with Water is Baptism into the faith of Christ, &c. These are Damnable Heresies, even to the denying the Lord that bought them.*

And here by the way I would have you take notice, that though the Quakers both in their writings and discourse seem mostly to clamour against *Infant Baptism*, yet this is only to amuse weak understandings; for we have no dispute with them about the proper Subjects of Baptism, but whether outward or Water Baptism be of Divine Institution. And this you see they have prophanely

phanely despised, and have utterly disowned. G. Whitehead in the very Title page of his *True Ministry*, &c. wrote particularly against the Anabaptists, who deny Infant Baptism, calls Water Baptism itself, *Idolatry*, and those who Baptize with Water, he says, *are doting about shadows and Carnal Ordinances*. If the *Quakers* will but once own, that this Sacrament is of Christ's appointment, we can easily make it appear, that Infants are as capable of the Seal of the Covenant under the Gospel, as heretofore under the Law. But to return; the *Quakers* have been used so frequently to scoff at, and revile these sacred Solemnities and Mystrious Rites of the Christian Religion, that notwithstanding their Principles are much more narrowly viewed than formerly, yet they cannot forbear even now their indecent expressions against these Divine Institutions. For in one of their latest books of controverſie, which I have so oft mentioned, *Wyeth* has endeavoured to ridicule and expose the Lord's Supper by such a dull piece of *Buffonry*, that is not usually to be met with; for after he has repeated these words of S. Paul, *This do ye as oft as ye drink it, in Remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till he come*. He with his usual confidence says, that *these words do not import any Command or Institution*; And challenges the Author of the Snake to prove, that they signifie any more than if one should say to him, *as often as thou goes to Westminster, call upon John Thompson*. Now what a profane wretch is this, to make the most Solemn Institutions of our Saviour, the Subject of his sport and drollery? Who but a *Quaker* would entertain his *Sober Reader* with such vile and senseless Raillery? But after all, where is the force of this ridiculous way of reasoning? For has it not been demonstrated a thousand times to the *Quakers* shame and Confusion, that our Saviour himself has expressly command-

Printed
1660.

Switch
p. 265.

ed

ed us to do this, i. e. to eat Bread and drink Wine, in Remembrance of him? But who ever commanded the Author of the *Snake* to go to *Westminster*? What egregious folly is this then, not to say madness, to pretend that we are no more obliged to commemorate the Death and Passion of our Saviour in the Holy Sacrament, than that Author is, when he goes to *Westminster*, to call upon *John Thompson*; when we are positively enjoined to perform the one, and he is under no manner of Obligation to do the other. This then in short is such childish trifling, and such a downright *burlesquing* the Holy Institutions of our Blessed Lord, which is no where to be met with but in the Quaker-Writings. Having now made good my charge against the *Quakers*, that they have despised and railed at our Saviours Ordinances of Water Baptism and the Lord's Supper; I am now in the second place to give you an account of some inventions of their own, which out of their great modesty, they are pleased to call the Ordinances of Jesus Christ. What these are, the World is well acquainted with, but if you have never heard of them, it cannot but surprize you to be told, that they are *Womens Preachings*, and *Womens Meetings* distinct from Mens. Now one might well wonder, how it should ever come into these mens heads, to fancy these novelties to be of Christs Institution; for we have an Apostolical Injunction against all Women preachers whatsoever. Hear S. Paul; Let your Women, says he, keep silence in the Churches; it is not permitted unto them to speak there. It is a shame for the Women to speak in the Church. Again, Let the Women learn in silence, with all Subjection. I suffer not a Woman to teach, nor usurp authority over the Man, but to be in silence. Now if the Quakers did not prefer *Fox's* orders, above the Authority of the Scriptures, surely these express words of an Apostle might have given some check to these Female Inspirados. And if the Women had either

Cor. 14.
35.

Tim. 2.
2.

ther the sense of modesty or shame, they would never have the confidence to be perk'd up in their Pulpit Galleries, dictating their pretended Inspirations to their deluded hearers. And as their Womens teaching is expressly forbidden, so there is not the least Foundation either in Scripture or Antiquity, for their having Meetings distinct from Men.

This is a mere fiction of the *Quakers*; and indeed both these projects were at first set a foot by *Fox*, though afterwards rigorously imposed by the *Quaker-Sanhedrim* on all their implicit followers. For after their great Apostle had once hammered these matters out, nothing would serve the *Quakers*, but that they must needs be of Divine Authority. The decree of one of their general Councils held at *London* 24. of the 3. Month 1675. runs thus, viz. *It is our Judgment and Testimony, in the Words of Gods Wisdom, that the Rise and Practice, setting up and Establishment of Men's and Womens Meetings (distinct from Men) in the Church of Christ, in this our Day and Generation, is according to the Mind and Counsel of God, and done in the ordering and leading of his Eternal Spirit.* It was in vain for the poor underling *Quakers* to plead the inconsistency of this as well as other impositions with the Infalibility of their Light. The Sufficiency of which (though mightily urged heretofore to draw off injudicious People from the Church) was overruled by the *Quaker-Grandeess*; and whoever would not submit to their female Church Government, was (as they phrase it) *to be recorded out of the unity.* However a great many of the sincerer sort would not comply with these arbitrary Laws of the *Foxonian Quakers*, which so disturbed their Famous Prophet *Solomon Eccles*, that See the his Spirit moved him to write a letter to one *John* first part *Story* (a stout opposer of their *Womens meetings*) of *Babel's* and for fear of miscarriage brought it himself; Builders wherein he calls *Womens meetings* and *Womens*
G Preach-

Preachings, the Good Ordinances which Jesus Christ has set up in his Church. And after he had severely reprov'd him, for opposing the *Womens* jurisdiction, he in his prophetick fury concludes thus, *This is the word of the Lord to thee, viz. That this year shalt thou, John Story die, because thou hast taught Rebellion against the living God.* But to the shame and confusion of the *Quaker-Prophets*, this *Story* lived several years after. Well; the *Quakers* perceiving that they could not with their lying Spirit take away the lives of their Brethren; they after this endeavour'd to destroy them by a Civil Death; For *sixty six* of *Foxes Admirers* in *London* thundered out a formal Excommunication against *Story, Wilkinson*, and a great many other *Quakers*, for not submitting to the *Laws* of their great Apostle, particularly about their *Womens Meetings*. But this as ill luck would have it, would not take neither; for the *Friends*, though in the Country, yet thought themselves to be guided by the *Light within*, as well as the *Friends* in the City; and therefore to be even with them, they very fairly issued out their *Bull* also against the City party, which was signed by *sixty seven* of the *Infallible Friends*; and these counter *Excommunications* stand both unrepealed to this Day.

Now from hence, there are two things very observable. First,

We have here a plain instance against the *Quakers* vain conceits of being *Infallible*. For how can these men set up for *Infallibility*, who have been so miserably deceived themselves? And what greater proof can there be of this, than their accusing and condemning one another with their *Contrary Bulls of Excommunication*? These in downright terms do flatly contradict each either; and yet if you will believe the *Quakers*, they were both given forth by an *Infallible Spirit*: But unless contradictions be true, one of the *Quaker-parties* was most certainly mistaken. And then what becomes

becomes of their Infallibility? Till therefore these Contradictory Quaker-Lights against Quaker-Lights can be reconciled, we have all the reason in the World to believe, that the *Friends* are so far from being Infallible, that they are guided by the Spirit of Error and Delusion. Which will still farther appear, if we consider secondly that the *Quakers* quarrelling among themselves about their *Womens Meetings*, seems to be a remarkable Judgment upon them, for their horrid Contempt of our Saviours own Institutions, and that for this cause God sends them strong Delusions, that they should believe a lye.

2 Thess. 2. 11.

For who but a Company of *Quakers* could ever be so besotted, as to believe *Fox's* inventions about *Womens Meetings* to be of Divine Authority? And though a great many of the *Friends* opposed them, insomuch that they fell together by the Ears among themselves about these matters; and those who would not yield, were called *White-heads* by *G. Whitehead* and several of that Tribe, by the Sweet names of *Treacherous Hypocrites*, *Betraying Judas's*, *Devils Incarnate*, &c. Yet at the same time they all agreed (like *Herod* and *Pontius Pilate* against our Saviour) with one consent to clamour against Water Baptism and the Lords Supper, which have ever been acknowledged by all the Christian World, to be of Divine Institution. This I say seems to be a Judgment of God upon these men, for their unaccountable obstinacy in rejecting and despising what our Blessed Lord has so plainly and expressly commanded.

White-heads' Epistle to Judgment fixed, &c.

They can revile, you see, the Holy Sacrament, and call it *Carnal*, and in derision and scorn, a *little Bread and Wine*, &c. and dare be so prophane as to tell us, that Baptizing of Infants is the *Doctrine of the Devil*! But as for their *Womens* Preachings and Meetings, O these are brought forth (saith *Penn*) by the Revelation and Power of the Heavenly Man *Christ Jesus* through his

Brief Examination, &c. p. 12. 13.

Taylor's E- *Faithful Witnesses.* And they are established, says
 pistle of another, *by the Power of God.* In short whoever
 caution, will not believe these things, the *Quakers* affirm,
 &c., 16 that they are *Devils Incarnate, Devil driven* and
 See more *Dungy Gods.* Now who could think, that these
 of this in Saints of the Lord and the Elect People of God
 some of called *Quakers* could give one another such vile
 the *Qua-* names, which surely at first were fetcht from Hell.
kers Prin- And all this Diabolical rage and fury were vented
ciples, &c. against their Fellow *Quakers*, chiefly on this ve-
p 10, 11, ry account, because they would not acknowledge
12, &c. *Womens Meetings* and *Preachings* to be the *Ordinances* of *Jesus Christ.* Well, but do we find
 these any where commanded in the Holy Scrip-
 tures? No matter for that, *Fox* has set them up,
 and his *Laws and Orders* are given forth, as *Taylor*
 has blasphemously declared, *from the Oracles of*
Divine Breath, and ought to be obeyed by all. Thus
 the *Quaker* Spirit in plain terms has given us a
 New Gospel and New Scriptures; The sad effect
 of which is worthy the *Friends* most serious con-
 sideration: *S. Paul* says, *though he himself or an*
Angel from Heaven, should preach any other Go-
 spel than that which he had preached, let him be
 accursed. He repeats this in the next verse with
 great earnestness, that it may make the deeper
 impression, *As we said before, so say I now again,*
If any man preach any other Gospel unto you, than
that ye have received, let him be accursed. This
 terrible Anathema is here denounced against all
 the perverters of the Gospel of Christ. And if
 the *Quakers* will maintain, as I have shewn you,
 that their *Womens Meetings* are established by the
Power of God, and that they are the good *Ordinances* of *Jesus Christ,* when there is not one word
 nor syllable of these matters revealed in the Go-
 spel which we have received; let them clear them-
 selves if they can from lying under this heavy
 curse of an Apostolical Spirit.

See his E-
 pistle, p.
 3.

Gal. 1. 8.

v. 9.

Thus you see I have made it very evident, that the *Quakers* have not only renounced the Ordinances and Institutions of Christ Jesus, but in their stead have set up Laws and Traditions of their own.

G 3

CHAP.

C H A P. IV.

the Of *the* Quakers Contempt of the Holy Scriptures.

S E C T. I.

*They deny the Scriptures to be their Rule
of Faith and Practice:*

THE last consequence I shall at present mention to you, that seems naturally to follow from the *Quaker*-Principle of the *Light within*, is their contempt of the Holy Scriptures. And; whoever carefully examines the *Quakers*-Principles and compares them with the Doctrine taught by Christ and his Apostles, will have great reason to believe, that *Quakerism* could never have got footing amongst as if the Holy Scriptures had been preserved in their due esteem and veneration; and therefore the chief Broachers of this *Pestilent Heresie*, being aware of this, bid open defiance to those sacred Monuments of our most Holy Religion, and at their first appearance came with full cry and open Mouths against them; and indeed endeavoured to run down all revealed Religion by whole sale. For a great many of their notions in Religion, are so extravagantly Ridiculous, that they never could have found any Entertainment in the minds of well meaning People, unless the Enemy of Souls had not first persuaded them to renounce the Gospel, and part with their *Bibles*.

Now

Now that the *Quakers* in effect have done this, is notoriously evident in their denying the Scriptures to be their Rule of Faith and Practice; that is they do not believe, that they are the means to convey to us the Christian Doctrine; or in other words, they will not allow them to be the standard or measure, by which we are to know what to believe and do in order to Salvation. But they are so miserably deluded as to dream of having the *same degree of the Spirit* with the *Prophets* and *Apostles*, by which the Scriptures were given forth; and therefore they cry up what they call the Spirit both for their Rule and Teacher, which they say will Infallibly Guide and conduct them without the Scripture in all Religious Affairs.

Now the plain Consequence from this is, that the *Quakers* are left at liberty to believe what they please, and do what they list. For what can restrain these men, who will not be concluded by the Laws of God revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures? If their Spirit moves them to believe any thing contained therein, well and good; if not they desire to be excused: For it is not any command of God in Scripture, that can bind them to Obedience, unless they have it commanded *a new* by Immediate Revelation. Hear their great Prophet *Burroughs*: *You take up a command, says he, from the letter, and you say Christ commands it, when the letter (meaning the Holy Scriptures) doth but declare it; but say in such a verse of such a Chapter, such a command is, not having received the command by the same Spirit.* Now the *Quakers* here have in so many words endeavoured wholly to destroy the Authority of the Scriptures; for you see they are resolved not to be convinced of any of their Errors by the plainest texts in the Bible. If we tell them they are no Christians, in believing the *Light within* to be sufficient to Salvation without any thing else; because this is quite contrary to the whole tenour and design

See his Works Reprinted 1672. p. 105.

John 1.

of the Gospel, which expressly declares, that we must have Faith in Jesus Christ who suffered at *Jerusalem*, &c. And that upon pain of Damnation. Now according to *Burroughs* all this signifies just nothing at all; for this is only a *Declaration* of the *letter*, or can only be proved from *such a verse of such a Chapter*; and what's this to the *Quakers*? Or if we endeavour to disprove their vain boasts of a sinless perfection by urging the words of an Apostle who has plainly told us, that, *If we say we have no Sin, we deceive our selves and the truth is not in us*. The *Friends* are proof against this also; for this is only to be found in *such a verse of such a Chapter*, and therefore they'll believe nothing of the matter. Again if we ask them how they can pretend to Christianity, when by embracing *Quakerism* they have renounced their Baptism, and have despised and horribly abused it and the Lord's Supper, though they are both positively and expressly commanded by Jesus Christ? Why to this they have a very easie and ready answer. That these are only *commands from the letter*, and we say *Christ commands it, when the letter doth but declare it*. Once more, if we desire to know why they cry up their *Womens Preachments* to be of Divine Institution, since *S. Paul* has told us that it was the Commandment of the Lord, that they should not preach at all? Well; no matter for that, *S. Paul* may say what he please, for his words are so far from binding us to Obedience, that if you'll believe the *Quakers*, they are just like all the other Laws of the Gospel, only *Commands from the letter*, and therefore not to be regarded. This is such a plain and necessary consequence from the *Quakers* own words, that if the greatest Enemies to the Scriptures could be but secure of this Anti Christian Doctrine, they need desire no other argument to destroy their Divine Authority; unless *Burroughs* could help them to a better; which he has really done in the same page above.

above-quoted, where I think he has even exceeded himself: for a little further he tells us, that *those are in the Witchcraft who observe commands without from the letter.* i. e. in plain English, that we are possessed by the Devil, if we obey the Laws of God contained in the Gospel! Now to what purpose is it, to quote the Scriptures to these men, that dare write after so profane a manner? All arguments drawn from thence you see are quite lost upon them; and therefore let us say, and prove what we will out of these blessed *writings*, they neither mind nor care; but are deaf to all persuasion. For do we think the *Friends* will be in the *Witchcraft* to *observe commands without from the Letter*? What! Must their Infallible Spirit be over rul'd by *Chapter and Verse*? No, No, they will not submit to the Laws of Jesus Christ, which are already plainly revealed, unless they receive *such and such commands by the same spirit*. That is, though the Doctrine of Christ be sufficiently made known to the World by the writings of the Apostles; yet unless the Laws of Christianity are Immediately revealed to the *Quakers*, they do not think themselves obliged either to believe or obey them; which is in short as much as to say, that if they cannot be Prophets and Apostles, they will not be Christians. But how come these men to imagine, that they shall *receive commands from the same Spirit that gave forth the Scriptures*? We readily grant, that the Divine Spirit is necessary to assist our sincere endeavours for the right understanding the sacred *writings*; but what then? Must we therefore expect to receive the Gospel by Immediate Revelation? Has not our Blessed Saviour long since plainly discovered to us the whole will of God in relation to Mankind? Why do the *Quakers* then wait for Immediate Impulses and Inspirations? Because the Apostles were enabled by an Extraordinary Assistance of the Holy Ghost not only to teach the Doctrines of Christ
but

but to deliver them down Infallibly in writing for the Eternal benefit and advantage of Mankind in all future ages ; therefore the *Quakers* will have the Christian Religion revealed to them in the *same way* and after the *same manner* as the Apostles had, or else they will not receive it at all. A right Quaker-Consequence ! Their Spirit or *Light within* has not inwardly revealed to them the Commands of Christ contained in the Scripture, therefore they will not obey them !

Reason a- abolishing Water-Baptism and the Lord's Sup-
gainst Rai- per, which he calls *Elementary Types* and *Figures*;
ling, p. that such, says he, are not *Commandments* to us,
150. unless required by the *same Spirit anew*. How !
Must our Saviour's Institutions be at the mercy of the *Quakers*, unless they are required by the *same Spirit anew* ? Why, is not Jesus Christ our Lawgiver ? And has not he Authority to Command our Obedience ? And are not his Laws plainly revealed to us in the Gospel ? Whoever will not believe the Authority of such a Lawgiver, and the promulging of such Laws to be sufficient Motives to Obedience, may be damned for their Infidelity. For it is a most horrible mistake to imagine with the *Quakers*, that the Holy Spirit do's now discover to us the will of God and our duty by Immediate Revelation : We have clear knowledge of these things in the Holy Scriptures ; which contain the last and most perfect Revelation of the will of God, which he intends to afford to the World. And if any will despise these means of Salvation in hopes of receiving *Commandments by the Spirit Anew* ; they must be miserable without Remedy. Yet the *Quakers* Spirit you see has taught them to throw off the Scriptures from being their Rule of Faith ; and to account them only *Commands without from the letter* ; and has introduced such senceless notions in Religion for Christianity, that are fit only for that Imposter Fox and his Seconds to reveal,
and

and their poor deluded Followers the *Quakers* to believe.

S E C T. II.

They deny the Holy Scriptures to be the word of God; yet make no Scruple of calling their own Writings, the word of the Lord. They have called the Writings of the Apostles Dust and Death, &c. And have published it in Print, That the Gospel has deceived them, and yet extoll their own Scribes, as being given out by the Power and Spirit of God.

A Second instance I shall give you of these mens Contempt of the Holy Scriptures, is their denying them to be the Word of God. *G. White-Ishmael* head with three other *Quakers* called Mr. Town-p. 17. send a Minister in *Norwich* a Blind sot, for pretending to prove from the Scriptures, *that they are the Written Word of God.* It would be too tedious to muster up quotations to prove this, which almost every body knows to be the *Quakers* opinion; and therefore I shall the rather endeavour to let you see, what poor excuses they have invented to clear themselves of such a scandal: Now all that they have to say, comes only to this; either that *the Scriptures don't call themselves so*; or else that *Christ is the word, and therefore the Friends dare not call them by that name.* But if we might have the liberty to produce Chapter and verse, the impertinence of both these

these reasons will easily appear, if you consider *First*.

v. 13. That the Laws of God are in the Holy Scriptures plainly call'd God's Word : This is very evident from the 7th of *S. Mark*, where we find Christ reproving the *Pharises* for perverting by their corrupt Glosses the Commandments of God; thereby making, says our Saviour, *the Word of God of none effect by your tradition*. Now if by the word of God is here meant the Laws of God, which were revealed to the World by *Moses* and the Prophets, the truth of which no man in his senses, that reads the contexts, can possibly doubt ; then it Follows, that the Holy Scriptures which do not only contain *Moses* and the Prophets, but also the will and mind of God delivered to Mankind by Christ and his Apostles, may and ought very properly be called the Word of God. And to make this yet more plain, hear *S. Paul*, *When*
 Theff. 2. ye received, says he, *the Word of God, which ye*
 3. *heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth the Word of God*. Here you see the Apostle makes a plain distinction between the Word of God, and the Word of men ; and he expressly calls the Doctrine of Christ which he preached the Word of God. Now if the Apostles did write the same which they preached, which is agreed on all hands; and that these are their Writings, which we call the Scriptures; then it must necessarily follow according to *S. Paul* that they are the Word of God. This is such a known truth and received principle that it has always been acknowledged by the whole Christian World ; yet the *Quakers* still cry out, that Christ he is the word, and so they cannot call the *Scripture* by that name. I must therefore in the second place examine the force of this reasoning ; and I confess it seems to me very strange, that ever any men of common sense should suffer themselves to be so lamentably imposed upon by such childish fallacies and apparent sophisms.

For wher's the absurdity, pray, to affirm the Scriptures to be God's Word, as they contain his will and mind revealed to the World by the sacred Penmen, and dictated to them by God's Infallible Spirit? Do's it therefore follow, that they are Christ the word, as he is the second Person of the ever Blessed Trinity? These *Quakers* are rare Logicians! What; no difference between Christ the word, which is God, and the Holy Scriptures which are the word of God? Mind what our Saviour hath told us, *He that rejecteth me, says he, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him at the last day.* Now what's the meaning here of the word *spoken*? Is it not the Gospel? And is not the word that Christ spake different from him that spake it? If the *Friends* are resolved to muddle and confound, what the Oracles of God and the reason of things have so plainly distinguished; I appeal to any persons of understanding who are the *Blind Sots*, the *Priests* or the *Quakers*.

John 1. 1.

John 12.
48.

And though no arguments have hitherto prevailed with these men, to own the Scriptures to be the word of God, yet they have frequently called their own Writings the Word of the Lord.

This is notorious enough; but why they dare call their own Books thus, and not the Holy Scriptures, is not easily to be reconciled. What! Has *G. Fox* the liberty to stile a rambling Scribble of his to *Oliver* and his Council (which I have now lying before me) the Word of the Lord, and do these *Quakers* think, that the Bible do's not deserve as good a Title? Yet they are so far from allowing this name to the Sacred Writings, that they have in several of their Books called them, the Dead letter, Dust and Death and Serpents meat, and other such vile and reproachful names. Hear *G. Fox* in his *News out of the North*, p. 14. *Your Original is Carnal, Hebrew, Greek and Latin, and your word is Carnal, the letter,*

ter, and the Light is Carnal, the letter; so Dust is the Serpents meat; their Original is but dust, which is but the letter which is Death. And their Gospel is but dust, Mathew, Mark, Luke and John, which is the letter. These seem to the Worlds People to be very Scandalous expressions, spoken in down-right contempt of the Holy Scriptures; but if you'll believe G. Whitehead, this is a very great mistake; for it's only the Ink and Paper, or the Inkey Character which they call Dust and Death and Serpents meat; yea verily it's nothing else. And therefore being asked, whether any body ever said, that the Ink and Paper were not dust? George Smartly replies, Here he, i. e. the Author of the Snake, yields the point; he grants, says he, the Ink and the Paper to be dust. What then? Was this ever a point in dispute?

Supplement to the Switch
p. 492.

The Discovery of the great Enmity of the Serpent p. 17.

Was there ever any debate about the Ink and Paper? No! Whitehead knows in his Conscience, that this is only a senceless shuffle to cover and hide their Great Apostles horrid and shameful Contempt of the Holy Scriptures. But what think they of Friend Deufberry? The Dead letter, says he, which man in his Carnal Wisdom called the Gospel and had deceived me. Now what's this that had deceived him; the Ink and Paper? No, No, these guilty excuses will not do, it's plain he meant the Doctrine and the Precepts of the Gospel. And here you see the Quaker-Spirit appears with his cloven Foot; for this is in plain English to tell us, that the Holy Jesus and his Blessed Apostles were Deceivers; which is such bellish Blatphemy that no Christian can think of, without the greatest horror. And I thought the Quakers themselves would never have attempted to defend such bare-faced Impiety; but I find I was mistaken; for they have endeavoured to justify this Blatphemy after such an Impudent manner, that if I had not received their vindication of it from their own hands, I could not have believed it. But having an occasion to

write

write to one of their *Preachers*, (he knows the provocation) concerning their Contempt of the Holy Scriptures amongst several other arguments that I made use of to prove it, I urged those words of *Deusberry* above quoted; and after about seven Months silence, they returned me this answer in defence of their *Friend William*; that what I mentioned were not his very words, but indeed a very lye of my own against him, since say they *W. D.* did neither say, nor mean that the Gospel had deceived him. I knew I touch'd the *Friends* on a sore place, and therefore did not wonder to hear them cry out; But for these men to send me word, that what I charged upon *W. D.* was a very lye of my own, is such a degree of Impudence, that none could be guilty of, that had either honesty or conscience; for I do assure you this was no second hand quotation, but I took it out of the Book it felt; and do here positively affirm that *William Deusberry* did both say and mean, that the Dead letter, which man in his Carnal Wisdom called the Gospel, and had deceived him.

However since the *Quakers* have spread it abroad in these parts, that I have belyed him in this quotation; I will here by the way let you see how rarely they have proved it; first they say that I left out the word [and] in my citation; but this is only shuffling, and will not do their business; for though I did omit [and] in my private letter, yet this omission did neither hurt nor spoil the sense; and therefore let this expression be either read with it or without it, yet it will be downright Blasphemy. Secondly they pretend, that I added [dead] to letter; now if they will out-brazen me I do not know how to help it, but for your Satisfaction I will at any time let you see the Book, and then you may be convinced with your own Eyes, that they have charged me with a most notorious falsehood. Well, if this will not do, then in the third place they tell me, that I have most wickedly dropt the
Subse-

- Subsequent words*; But if I can clearly demonstrate that they have no Relation to the foregoing Blasphemous Expression, then I appeal to the World whether these men have any shame or modesty thus unjustly to accuse me of *having most wickedly dropt words*, that did not in the least belong to the Subject before me. Now that this is very evident, will appear from *Deusberry* himself; for you must know that he was a Soldier in the late Civil Wars, and as he pretended the Lord commanded him to put up his sword into his Scabbard, by telling him, *his Kingdom was not of this World, or else his children would have fought.* This word, he said, enlightened his heart, and discovered the mystery of Iniquity, and that the Kingdom of Christ was within; and the Enemies were spiritual and within, and his weapons must be spiritual.
- p. 16. He then tells us what his resolutions were upon this, viz. *that he could no longer fight with a Carnal weapon against a Carnal man.* Now it's plain here from his own words, that before he received this pretended message, he had quite mistook the Nature of Christ's Kingdom, and did really think it was of this World, and fancying himself to have been of Christ's party did intend to have fought for him; But how came he to think so, or how came he to be thus mistaken? Why he gives us this wicked reason for it, by belching out the above mentioned Blasphemy; *for the dead letter* (says this wretch) *which man in his Carnal Wisdom, called the Gospel, and*
- p. 17. *had deceived me*; these are his very words, and if this be not rank, wild Blasphemy. I desire the Friends to tell me what is. Now what are the Subsequent words, that the Quakers have charged me to have most wickedly dropt? Why they quote them thus. viz. *But then the Lord discovered to me the deccits of all these men*; and here they make a break, but why did not they go on? Why? Because the words following as well as those they have mentioned, are nothing to the

the purpose, and run quite off to another matter; for after [men] follows in England, that were seeking the Kingdom of Heaven in outward Observations. And yet these are the Subsequent words that I have most wickedly dropt! This is all that the Friends have offered to help Sweet William out of the mire, which does but sink themselves so much the deeper into it. For by this any man of common understanding may easily perceive, that they take the liberty to write what they please, though without any regard either to truth or justice. Although this may seem too long a digression, yet I thought it necessary to give the Friends this publick notice, that I know beforehand what they can say to evade this quotation; that when they answer this Book, they would not sham and put me off in Print, as they have already done in Manuscript. For these words are of great consequence, as coming from no mean person among them, and therefore are not thus lightly to be passed over. This Deusberry has not only affirmed that the Gospel had deceived him, but that it was a Carnal imagination to believe God to be in Heaven! See Penn's And yet W. Penn ranks him almost in the very Preface to front of their Famous Worthies, and esteems him Fox's Jour- as one of the first and most Eminent of those that were convinced, as he terms it, by G. Fox. And Margaret Fox affirms him to have been one also of the first that received her Husband; and came to be a Faithful Minister of the Spirit. Fox himself also takes particular notice of him several times in his Journal. See her Testimony in the said Journal p. 2.

From all which then I think we may draw this conclusion, That if this Quaker was esteemed by their Principal Leaders as a most Eminent and Faithful Minister of the Spirit, and yet was most certainly possessed by the Spirit of Blatphemy; it must necessarily follow, that they acted by the same Spirit now; and therefore that Light within which they have all along mistaken

tures out of their Meetings, and never suffer them to be publickly read amongst them?

Deut 31.
6, &c.
Acts 13.
5. 27.
5. 21. 1.

That the Church of God has in all Ages read his Word, when they met for Religious Worship, as God himself has positively commanded, is too evident to be denyed: But who ever heard of a Chapter of the Bible being read in a *Quakers* Meeting? It's now about 50 Years since *Quakerism* first appeared in *England*, and indeed in the World; and yet in all this time the *Quaker*-Leaders have never given any orders for the publick reading of the Holy Scriptures; although they have frequently commanded and encouraged their own Epistles to be read in their Assemblies. I know the *Friends* don't love to hear of this, because it is such a notorious preferring their own little Scribbles above the revealed will of God; yet I do assure you, I have several of their Epistles by me, that are expressly ordered to be read in their Meetings: particularly one wrote by that Precious *Quaker*, *William Densoerry*, which he directs, *to all the Faithful, &c.* and this is to be sent with care abroad to be read in the Assemblies of the Church of the first born. Also one by *Humphrey Smith*, which he tells us is written only for *Friends* who can read it; and this he desires may be read in such Meetings, where and when *Friends* of the Ministry are wanting. This may do very well for the *Friends* in these parts, who if they happen to meet, when a certain person is absent, though they all set up for immediate Inspiration, yet at those seasons, (as I have been informed,) are forced to take up with the poor refreshings only of a silent Meeting. I can shew you divers of these kind of Epistles, as *William Penn's* to the Children of Light. I desire, says he, that this Epistle may be read in your several Meetings; *Elizabeth Henderick's* Epistle to *Friends* in *England* to be read in their Assemblies, as also *Waldenfield's*, &c. but above all I have two more remarkable than any I have yet seen; for one

one of them is said to be written in *Rome-Prison* of Madmen; and the other at *Lyons in France*, both by a very great man, who is pleased to stile himself, *the Servant of God*, John; and therefore we need not wonder, he should conclude his last *Epistle* after a very extraordinary manner, for he Subscribes thus, *viz. I am your sister in our Spouse John*. If ever the *Pope* gave us a proof of his *Infallibility*, it was surely, when he commanded this same *John the Quakers sister* to be put amongst his Mad-folks; for I think every Body will conclude, that a dark room was a very convenient lodging for such a wild and extravagant Enthusiast. But after all, whether this was not a verbal mistake to print Sister for Brother, I shall not undertake to determine, (as *G. Whitehead* says in defence of *Burroughs* who has Blatphemously affirmed that the *Sufferings* of the *Quakers* were more unjust than the *Sufferings* of *Christ* or his *Apostles*, &c.) unless I see *John's Original Copy*. We all know Brother and Sister are very near akin, and who can tell but *John's Printer* might mistake one for t'other? Only the mischief on't is, the letters of their names are a little different. However let this be as it will, these Famous *Epistles* of *John the Sister* are to be read by the *Flock of the Lord*!

See *Whitehead's Artidote*. p. 254.

This is enough to convince you, that the *Quakers* have actually ordered their own writings to be read in their Meetings, of which sort I could give you a Catalogue of about twenty or more; and I challenge them to produce out of all their Books any such encouragement for the reading of the Holy Scriptures. Upon the whole then, what shall we say to these men who have had the confidence to tell the *Parliament*, that they believe the *Holy Scriptures* of the *Old and New Testament*, are of *Divine Authority*, as being given by *Inspiration of God*?

Quakers vindicated on presented by them to the *Parliament*.

For do's not the Contrary plainly appear from ament, their own words, and out of their own Wri- 1693.

things? Has not *Burroughs* roundly told us, that they are in the *Witchcraft*, who observe *Command Without from the letter*? Has not *Fox* also branded the sacred Writings as being *Carnal, Death, dust,* and *Serpents Meat*? Has not *Deusberry* published it in the Face of the Nation, that the *Gospel* had deceived him? What do these *Quakers* mean then to Smooth it to the *Parliament* as if they did really believe the Holy Scriptures to be of Divine Authority? In a word; till they can either reconcile their own contradictions, or will renounce and retract what they have Blasphemously spoken against the Bible; (which they have never yet done) you have all the reason imaginable to believe that the *Quakers*, as I have shewn you in several instances, have very prophanely abused and treated with the last Contempt the Holy Scriptures.

The Conclusion.

THUS, I have endeavoured to give you, (my *Honest Neighbours*) a short account of some of the *Quaker-Errors* which I told you were to utterly destructive to the Christian Religion.

I suppose none of you can imagine that I have thrust my self unnecessarily into a Controversie with the *Quakers*; I assure you, I am really sorry, that I have so just an occasion to appear against them. It being no little surprize to me, to see such a small number of them erect a large and spacious Meeting House amongst us. For it's well known, that the *Friends* are seldom guilty of such an over sight, as to lay out a good round Sum, without great hopes of a considerable Advantage. If they had no design by this, to encrease their Party, I shall be glad to find my self mistaken. However it's notoriously evident that they are always Solicitous to gain Profelytes
and

and where ever they have any Meetings, are very busie by all their little arts of perswasion to tempt their acquaintance, and especially those over whom they have any influence to go with them to hear their Speakers.

And therefore to countermine them in this and other such like practices, I thought it very proper to lay before you in these Papers, some of their pernicious Principles; which if attentively read, and impartially considered, I doubt not will in some measure by God's Assistance not only arm you against their most dangerous opinions, but will also confirm you in the Christian Faith, as it is Taught and Practised in the Church of England.

And here give me leave to observe to you, that it is a great fault, for any of our Communion to be so easily wheedled (as I am afraid too many are) into a *Quakers* Meeting. And though this be a crime, that I hope very few of you are at present guilty of; yet that I may wholly prevent you or others from being drawn hereafter into their Snares by this means, let me desire you to take the Bible into your hands, and mind how our Saviour has cautioned his Followers not to be gulled and deceived by such false Teachers that should come to them *in sheeps Cloath-* Mat. 7. 1
ing, that is with soft and smooth pretences, and all the pleasing arts of insinuation; but inwardly were *ravening Wolves*, dividing the Flock as one well observes, that they may the more easily devour them, and making a Prey of them whom they pretend to feed. These he afterward described by their divided Dialect, one saying, *Lo, here is* Mat. 23. 26.
Christ and another there. And when things come to this pass, that one saith, *Behold he is in the field*; another, *he is in the Secret Chambers*; a third in the Meeting House; 'tis time to hearken to our Saviours Advice, *Believe them not, and go not after them.*

Acts 20. The Apostle likewise foretold of such seducers,
 30. that would arise in the latter days speaking per-
 verse things to draw Disciples after them; he de-
 scribes them very plainly by their creeping into
 2 Tim. 3. houses and leading captive silly Women laden with
 6. divers lusts; and therefore we are exhorted to
 Mark them that cause divisions and to avoid
 them. For they serve not our Lord Jesus Christ
 Rom. 16. but their own belly; and by good words and fair
 17. 18. speeches deceive the Hearts of the simple.

Now if in these and several other such exhortations in Scripture, we are not only forewarned but commanded to avoid those that cause divisions among Christians, how much more careful then ought we to be, not to run to the Meetings of those, that are the professed and open Enemies of our Religion? You don't find the Friends so complaisant to go with you to serve God in our Churches; nay I am apt to believe if you should but ask them to hear a Sermon by one of our best Preachers in England, they would afford you but a very indifferent answer; and perhaps if you should urge this with some earnestness, would take it as a mighty affront, and put you off with a Scornful smile and flat denial.

Why then should any who acknowledge themselves Members of this Church be so soft and easie, as to hearken and yield to the Quakers Solicitations.

Yet there are a great many, that are pleased with every novelty, and will go to a Meeting to Satisfie a vain curiosity; or else are of unstable minds, and of loose and unfixed Principles; or in
 2 Tim. 4. short, as the Apostles says, *have itching ears*. But
 3. surely none of these will be accounted good qualifications among sober and serious Christians.

Let me therefore reason a little with these gadders to Meetings; what can you propose to yourselves by going amongst the Quakers? Is not the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles clearly delivered-

livered to us in the Holy Scriptures? And are not they publickly read and fully explained to you in your own Churches? And that so very full and large, that I challenge, the *Friends* to name but one single point in the Christian Religion, that is not taught and pressed home on the Consciences of men by the Divines of the Church of *England*. Why then should you run after the *Quaker-Teachers*? How can you ever hope to learn any Christian Duty from those men who have published and maintained such vile and abominable Errors themselves? You can never gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles. In a word; Mat. 7. 16. since I have sufficiently proved in the foregoing Discourse, that the *Quakers* Notions of the *Light within*, with it's Consequences, are utterly inconsistent with the Christian Faith; I hope none of you that have a due regard and serious concern for the Salvation of your Souls, will give any ear to the crafty insinuations of men of such pernicious Principles, whose main design by importuning you to their Meetings is to prejudice you against that Church in which you were baptized, that so by degrees they may gain you to their Party; and Consequently if you once come to be *Fox's* Disciples, you must renounce your Christian Baptism, and by embracing *Quakerism*, must throw off Christianity; for those who believe as the *Quakers* do only in the *Light within*, are those miserable Hereticks foretold of by the 2 Pet. 2. 1 Apostle, who brought in damnable Doctrines, denying the Lord who bought them.

These I confess are hard sayings; and some perhaps that have look'd into the *Quaker* Pamphlets, which the *Friends* have industriously spread abroad, will be apt to imagine, that they have quite other-guets notions in Religion, than I have represented. For they find them to make great professions of Christianity; and that they seem to believe in Jesus Christ as he is both God and Man, &c. and speak with great esteem of the Holy

Holy Scriptures, &c. and therefore for their parts they cannot understand, that their Adversaries deal fairly by them, to make the World believe, that they are no Christians; or that they hold such and such opinions so contrary to the Christian Religion.

This is a popular Objection or rather prejudice that I foresee some will be apt to raise against this Discourse: which I shall endeavour here to remove, and then close all.

Now I easily grant that the *Quakers* have of late vamped up their Religion in a new dress; and have drawn it in livelier colours than formerly, that it may appear to be Christian. Yet all their seemingly fair Confessions of the Christian Faith which are to be met with in several of their modern Books are only like some sort of Stones artificially set, that though they make a glaring shew at a distance, enough to dazle with their false light an undiscerning eye; yet those that have skill, can easily distinguish the shining lustre of a true Diamond, from the faint glitterings of a counterfeit pebble. For all those fine words that they have given us of their Believing in Jesus Christ, &c. are only to amuse and deceive well meaning People and their unwary Readers; as will very plainly appear, when you consider the two following reasons. *First,*

Because the *Quakers* have a hidden meaning in their Expressions about Christ, &c. and use words when they make mention of him in their *Publick Testimonies* as they call them, in a quite different sense from all the Christian World. As for instance, *G. Whitehead* tells us, that the *Disc. sign'd* vinity and Humanity, i. e. Manhood of Christ Jesus, by George that as he is true God, and he is most Glorious *Whitehead* man, &c. they i. e. the *Quakers* do livingly believe, and that they have often sincerely confessed this in their *Publick Testimonies and Writings*. Now who dares question the *Quakers* Christianity? Is not here as good a Confession as can be made in words,

A few Positions,

words, that they are Christians? What would
 we have more? Or what reason have we not to
 believe them? Thus many are apt to be imposed
 on, by a slight and Superficial view of some of
 the *Quakers* Writings. But alas they do not un-
 derstand that deep dissimulation which lies
 lurking under these specious appearances of Chri-
 stianity. For notwithstanding the *Friends* make
 mighty pretences to the greatest plainness and
 sincerity; yet you must know that they do not
 mean by the Humanity or Manhood of Christ
 Jesus, what all Christians understand by it, viz.
 the Manhood which he took of our nature in the
 Womb of the *Virgin* into his own Person: No,
 No, this is far from their meaning; for they have
 strange notions of Christ being man as well as
 God from all Eternity; and madly dream of his
 having a Body before he came into the World;
 and this they call his Spiritual Flesh and Blood * *See this*
 which they suppose to have within them, and is *proved at*
 what they mean by the *Light within* *. And *large in*
 thus by the help of these secret distinctions that *the De-*
 they have got of an outward, created, Manhood, *fence*
 and an Heavenly, uncreated Manhood, they talk *of the*
 in the clouds, and play at fast and loose with *Snake*
 the World; and there's no hold to be taken on them. *part I.*
 nor can we know their meaning by their words. *from page*
 Therefore till the *Quakers* either renounce this *9th. to*
 distinction of the two Manhood's of Christ, or in *page the*
 plain terms let us know what Manhood they do *25th. to*
 believe him to have now in Heaven; all their *which for*
 general Confessions of their Faith are no proofs *brevity*
 of their being sound and orthodox Christi- *ake I refer*
 ans. *you.*

Secondly, Another Reason why their Confessions
 are of so little Consequence as not to be regarded,
 is, because notwithstanding it has been plainly
 made appear (especially of late) that they have
 in their printed Books most notoriously contrad-
 icted the very fundamentals of the Christian Re-
 ligion; yet they have been so far from retra-
 cting

See also
his Prim.
Christ.
Continu-
ed, &c.

Etting or condemning any of those vile Errors with which they been have charged from undeniable matters of Fact; that they publickly declare, they are not changed in their Principles; and that they are the same now they were when first a People. Thus their yearly Epistle Printed 1696. informs us, for the *Quakers are therein required to hold up the Holy Testimony of Truth, which hath made us, say their Leaders, a People to God, and preserved us so unto this Day; and that in all the Parts of it; for truth is one, and changes not; and what it convinced us of to be Evil in the Beginning, it reproveth still.* Wyeth, he affirms the same in his *Appendix, &c.* p. 6. *Our Principles, says he, are now no other than what they were, when we were first a People; for truth changes not.* And that we should be sure to mind him, he affirms it once more p. 53. *That their Principles are now no other than what they were when first a People.* Here you see the modern *Quakers* are of the same mind with the *Ancient Friends*; and therefore are obliged to answer to God and the World for all their Blasphemies against Jesus Christ, his sacred Ordinances and the Holy Scriptures. They must not think to come off by contradicting their former *Testimonies*; for this without confessing their former Errors, will not do their business; there is now no compounding the matter; it is not glossing over *Quakerism* with a little Sophistry and Art, and a deal of Dissimulation, that will atone for their vile Heresies and Anti-Christian Doctrines. If they had indeed any where told us, that they were sorry for those Scandalous expressions, that were to be so frequently found in their Writings against the Christian Religion; and that they had now both disowned them and their Authors, this I confess would have been to the purpose; but they are so far from ever acknowledging themselves to have been mistaken, that it is now their great business to make the World believe

lieve, that they are just the *same in their Principles*, that ever they were; and that they have *never changed* since they were first a People. For having at first set up to receive every thing from Immediate Revelation and from the Mouth of the Lord, they are resolved right or wrong to stand by this Principle now; and therefore when they gave some account of the Conference at *West-Dereham in Norfolk*, we have in the post man these words: *The Quakers not Questioning but to January Acquit their Antient Friends and their Writings* ¹⁴ 1699. *from those Black charges, (i. e. of Blasphemy) not being conscious of deviating in any one Point of Doctrine from what they First held.* This is enough to convince any man that will but make use of his reason, that the *Quakers* Christian-like Confessions, are only so many downright contradictions to what they have formerly taught, and do yet really believe to be true; and therefore we cannot justly be accused for exposing those Principles to the World, which you plainly see they are resolved both to justify and defend. And yet as I have oft observed to you, and have sufficiently proved, are the most vile and dangerous Errors, that ever Infested the Christian Church and Religion.

I could heartily wish the well meaning among the *Quakers* would be so kind to their own Souls as impartially without any prejudice or passion to think of these matters which I have here offered to your serious Consideration. And I doubt not but they would then quickly renounce and utterly abhor those Anti-Christian Doctrines, that are now most certainly taught by their Grandees and Principal Leaders. For I have that Charity for a great many of them, to believe that they do not understand that deep Mystery of Iniquity, that lies at the bottom of *Quakerism*.

But they have no mind to view themselves in a true glass; it being no very easie matter to persuade them to look into the Books, that are
wrote

wrote against them. For the Leading men of their own Party have always endeavoured to brand those that oppose them with such names of Infamy and Reproach; that their implicate followers are unaccountably prejudiced and forearmed against every thing that can be said in order to their conviction. They take all for Oracles, that are to be found in the Writings of their teachers; and esteem all to be lyes and forgeries, that are published to discover their fatal delusions. They generally read only their own Books, that are sent down by order from above, where they are sure to find every thing drawn to their own advantage; and then having nothing to contradict them, in their own Conceits they carry all before them; and thus being pleased with imaginary Conquests, they boast and triumph without a Victory. And I doubt not but a great many well meaning People have been drawn into the Snares of *Quakerism*, merely by poring over, and puzzling themselves with the *Quaker* Pamphlets. For it once the *Friends* perceive any of their acquaintance or Neighbourhood have a desire to read their Books, they are always ready to furnish them with those Modern treatises, that have so muffled up and disguised their Opinions, that less judicious persons may be apt to mistake them for Christianity; and not having either the leisure thoroughly to examine their Principles, or perhaps wanting the capacity to distinguish between Truth and Falshood, yet being *wise in their own Conceits*, will rely on their own judgments; and if they happen to light on any little sophism which they don't know what to make of, or any of the *Quakers* quibbling evasions that they cannot readily answer, presently conclude that no Body else can; and so perhaps the next news we hear of them is, that they are turned *Quakers*. But how these men can justify themselves to God and their own Souls thus rashly and unadvisedly to renounce their Christian

Christian Baptism, by running headling into all the Confusions of this *Sect*, is worthy of their most thoughtful Reflections. It is not saying they thought themselves to be in the right, that will excuse them hereafter if they are now in the wrong; for although I doubt not the far greater number of them do really believe *Quakerism* to be Christianity, and that by living agreeably to their Principles, they do act according to the present dictates of their *consciences*, yet all this they may do, and notwithstanding be very far from being good Christians. Every Body knows that the worst actions in the World have been done under the Pretence of *Conscience*. Did not S Paul think himself bound to do many things against the name of Jesus of Nazareth? yet he calls himself a *Blasphemer*, and the *Greatest of Sinners*, for what he did under that obligation of *Conscience*. Our saviour tells his Disciples that *the time should come*, when the *Jews* should put them to Death, thinking they did God good service; Nay the *Jews* Murdered the Son of God himself through Ignorance and a false Persuasion of Mind.

Acts 26.9

1 Tim. 1.
13, 15.

Joh. 16.2

You see then plainly from these instances that men may follow the present dictates of their *consciences*, and yet be guilty of Damning Sins. Well, but you may say, must not the *Quakers* as well as others act according to their *consciences*? Yes no doubt of it; But if they will not endeavour to inform their *consciences* aright, by reading on both sides of the Question; if they will not fairly and impartially consult our Books as well as their own, and calmly hear and seriously consider what can be said against their Opinions, and compare and examine things with that care and diligence as they ought; If they will be Stubborn and obstinate, and impatient of Contradiction, form their Judgments by their Passions; if Pride or self Conceit and Contempt of Instruction should byass or hinder them from either knowing or embracing the plain Truths of the Gospel;

Gospel; in any of these or the like cases *Following their Consciences* will never atone for their Infidelity at the Day of Judgment.

Acts 4. 12

Heb 12.

4. 11. 6.

Let me then exhort and conjure you, as you love your Souls, and as you ever hope to enjoy a Blessed Eternity, not to be only careful to live well, but also to have a true and living Faith in a Crucified Jesus ! For let me once more put you in mind of what is to expressly told us, that *there is no Salvation in any other*; and that *there is none other name* (or Authority) *under Heaven given among Men, whereby we must be saved.* For as *without Holiness no man shall see the Lord*, so *without Faith it is Impossible to please God.*

I did once design to have taken notice of several others of the *Quaker* Errors, particularly of their strange obstinacy in not paying their Tithes; but I have already far exceeded my first intended bounds; for *Quakerism* is so fruitful a field, and affords such variety of mistakes both in Principle and Practice, that having once begun with them, one does not know well how to give over. However if what I now send you meets with a kind reception, I may God willing in due time give you an account of this and several other matters very proper for your Information.

But here give me leave to tell you, that their Stubborn refusal of paying Tithes proceeds from a sordid covetousness and an implacable hatred of the Preachers of the Christian Religion, founded on the greatest Injustice. For what can be a more notorious violation of the known rules of Common honesty, than for these men to detain what of Right belongs to another Person ? This is in plain terms downright Cheating; and yet to do this under the pretence of Conscience, is excusing one sin by committing of another. For is this Conscience to defraud their Neighbour ? And is not this defrauding a man, to deprive him of what is his just Right by the Laws of our

our Countrey? The Ministers of the Gospel have by the Laws of Jesus Christ, a just Right to a Maintenance; for so *S. Paul* saith, that *the Lord hath ordained that they which Preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.* Now if the Supreme Authority (as is plain amongst us) hath determined the Tenth to be this Maintenance as being agreeable to what God himself expressly Commanded to be paid by his own People the Jews, and is no where forbidden under the Gospel; what becomes then of the great honesty of the *Quakers* to rob us of that, which we ought to enjoy by a legal Right founded upon Divine Authority? Ay, but they pretend, that paying or receiving Tythe is *denying Christ to be come in the Flesh*: How so? Is supporting those that Preach up the Necessity of Faith in Jesus Christ, a Mark of being the Subjects of *Anti-Christ*? Or is having a competent Maintenance to that End, any part of the Ceremonial Law? These *Quakers* are mighty nice Folk! They can tell us that the Light Within (*all Men*) is Sufficient for Salvation without any thing else; and have utterly denied the outward Person that suffered at *Jerusalem* to be Properly the Son of God: and have called those false Ministers, that Preach Christ to be in Heaven; and have pronounced the Devil to be in those that expect to be saved by a Christ without them; and yet these poor Scrupulous People dare not be just and honest betwixt man and man for fear of being Anti-Christian! But as I told you I cannot now stay to set this business of Tythe (which the *Quakers* have always endeavoured to confound,) in its true Light, which perhaps may be done hereafter.

In the mean time, I desire you to accept of this small present, as a Publick Testimony of that great regard and kindness I have for you; which I think cannot be better expressed at present whilst so many False Teachers are let loose upon you,

I

than

than by my utmost endeavours to preserve you, from their Corrupt and unsound Principles in Religion.

Dr. Harvey in his Introduction to the Vanities of Philosophy, &c.

When I first set Pen to Paper, I little thought to make any of these kind of Discourses Publick, but only intended them for your Private use ; But as an Ingenious Person hath lately told the World, that one main reason of his *Printing a Book, was that writing an ill hand, he might read it the better himself* ; to one of the Chiefest motives I had in Publishing this was, because I hoped upon second thoughts it might be useful to a great many, who cannot read any written hand at all ; and therefore shall make no other excuse for presenting so plain a Discourse to publick View, it being not designed as an Entertainment for the more curious, and Learned part of the World, but only as a sort of Manual, for the unlearned and honest Members of our own Communion, by giving them a short view of some of the *Quakers* Anti-Christian Principles in order to confirm them in the Church of *England* ; or if it might be so fortunate to open the eyes of some of the well meaning People among themselves ; I shall think my time to have been very well employed. And as I hope all wise and good men will make a Candid and Favourable Judgment of this Undertaking, so I shall little regard what the rest of the World think of it, for I neither court their applause nor value their censure.

The *Quakers* I know will give me no quarter ; Opposing their Errors is such an unpardonable Crime, that whoever dares be so hardy as to encounter them, must never expect to be forgiven. These men usually pass amongst us for a sort of quiet, peaceable and inoffensive People, and those that converse with them only about ordinary business, and the common Affairs of Life, would be almost tempted to believe, that scarce any thing

thing could put them out of humour ; and yet do but tell them of some of their Pernicious Principles, and then these Poor Innocent Lambs, for all their half smile, will rail and revile like so many Furies ; there's no talking to them about these matters ; if you contradict them, they are out of all patience, their blood is presently upon the fret, and their passion boils over and spends it self in rage and madness against all their Adversaries.

Whoever will consult the seventeenth Section of the Snake in the Grass, or a little Pamphlet called *some of the Quakers Principles*, &c. may easily be satisfied that I don't misrepresent them. And I know this in some measure to be true by experience ; for though I have been only battling with them in a private letter or two, yet they have given me a Cast of their Office, and thank them for their love, I have tasted already of their Scolding Civilities. They have compared me to the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, and have called me *Brother in Iniquity with Bugg*, a *restless Incendiary*, and *guilty of lying accusations* ; *worth in dear Brother in Enmity with the Author of the Snake*, one of an *Ishmaelitish* air and an *Irreligious Derider*, &c. yet these are only some of their honey words and the common Flowers of their ordinary Rhetorick ; but now I publicly appear against them, I would gladly compound for such kind and gentle usage. However if they will but answer me fairly and upon the square, Section by Section, I shall not much trouble my self about their hard names. And if they will not do this, it's plain, that they are conscious of their own guilt ; and that their Principles cannot be defended. If they pretend that I have only mustered up some old Charges that have long since been oft replied to, and therefore not worth their notice ; I am apt to believe they'll find themselves mistaken, for although I shall not be so vain to say that the World hath not

H. Pick-
his Lear-
ned Dis-
course
to the
Friends,
&c.
page 1. 2.
4, 6, 7,
&c.
MSS.

heard of a great many of these matters before; yet I am pretty confident the *Quakers* have not fairly answered them, nor I believe ever can. And upon perusal they may find (if they will not slip them over) some Books and several Quotations which have never been urged before. I have not to my knowledge wronged them either in Book, Citation or Inference; and if I am mistaken in my Judgment in really believing them not to be sound in the Faith, let them plainly make it appear, that they are so, and I shall be satisfied. For it is only the truth of the Christian Religion that I contend for, and having of late look'd a little more narrowly into their Books than formerly, I am in my Conscience fully persuaded, that where *Quakerism* gets footing, there the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles loses Ground. And therefore that I may contribute something to stop its Gangrene amongst you, is the great design of these Papers; and God of his infinite Mercy Grant them this much-wisht-for success.

*I am your Assured Friend, and one who shall
ever be ready to promote your Eternal Salvation.*

John Stillingfleet.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A,

PAGE 2. line 18. for *Righteous*, read *Righteousness*. p. 9. l. 18. r. *is really the Effect*. p. 14. l. 26. after *violence*, add &c. p. 32. l. 35. r. *Dark*. p. 47. l. 2. r. *of their*. p. 48. l. 5. r. *exult*. p. 55. l. 14. r. *Repentance*. p. 56. l. 15. r. *made this*. p. 59. l. 16, & 19. r. *Flesh and Bones*. l. 29. r. *Sword of the Lord*. p. 77. l. 32. r. *Bread*. l. 34. r. *Holy*. p. 82. l. 37. for each either, r. each other. p. 86. l. 1. r. *Of the*. l. 14. for *as*, r. *us*. p. 96. l. 31. r. *and had deceived me*. p. 97. l. 37. r. *Minister*. l. 39. r. *they are assisted*. p. 98. l. 23. r. *it was ordered in their Epistle for that year that*. p. 100. l. 1st. for *seem*, r. *seen*. p. 102. l. 1. r. *that*. l. 2. r. *Commands*. p. 108. l. 2. r. *they have been*. p. 111. l. 1. r. *running headlong*. Some few literal Mistakes, as *petty* for *petty*, *Imposter* for *Impostor*, *prefering* for *prefering*, &c. are left to the Reader's Candour and Amendment.